LIBRARY

OF THE

University of California.

No. 420

Division

Range 759

Shelf D676

Received May 1869.

PRESENTED TO THE

Library of the University of California,

— BY —

John W. Dwinelle

May A. D. 1869

PRINTING. BINDING. LITHOGRAPHING. ENGRAVING.

A. L. BANCROFT & Co.

Booksellers and Stationers

721 MARKET ST.

SAN FRANCISCO.

FASHIONABLE STATIONERY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/varronianuscriti00donarich

76

VARRONIANUS.

LICET OMNIA ITALICA PRO ROMANIS HABEAM.—QUINTIL.

Cambridge:
Printed at the University Press.

VARRONIANUS:

A CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

TO THE

ETHNOGRAPHY OF ANCIENT ITALY

AND TO

THE PHILOLOGICAL STUDY OF THE LATIN LANGUAGE.

BY

JOHN WILLIAM DONALDSON, D.D.,

HEAD MASTER OF BURY SCHOOL;

AND FORMERLY FELLOW AND CLASSICAL LECTURER OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

SECOND EDITION,

REVISED AND CONSIDERABLY ENLARGED.

LONDON: JOHN W. PARKER AND SON.

CAMBRIDGE: JOHN DEIGHTON.

1852.

PA-20
D6
1852
MAIN

TO

THE RIGHT REVEREND

CONNOP THIRLWALL, D.D.

LORD BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S,

PRESIDENT OF THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY,

ETC. ETC.

My Lord,

In repeating my dedication of this work to your Lordship, I may perhaps feel more confidence, than when I first inscribed it with your distinguished name, not only because it has, to a certain extent, obtained the approval of the public to which it appealed, but still more, because I am enabled to revise it with such additional knowledge as I have acquired in the interval since its first appearance. But the renewal of my labours in this field has increased my conviction of the difficulties, which attend a scientific examination of the Latin Language; and I have introduced so much new matter, that I must feel anxious to know, whether the conclusions, at which I have arrived, are likely to be sanctioned by your Lordship and other competent judges. However this may be, the republication of this book has at least given me an opportunity of renewing the expression of my respect and esteem for your Lordship, and of declaring my undiminished appreciation of the services, which you have rendered to the students of classical philology in this country.

I have the honour to be,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's faithful servant,

J. W. DONALDSON.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

THIS work, as it originally appeared, was a first attempt to discuss the comparative philology of the Latin Language on the broad basis of general Ethnography, and to show historically how the classical idiom of ancient Rome resulted from the absorption or centralisation of the other dialects spoken in the Peninsula. My motto was: *licet omnia Italica pro Romanis habeam;* and I did not content myself with a survey of the Italian races, but endeavoured to prove that the elements of this cisalpine population might be recognised in the Scythia of Herodotus, either in juxta-position or in some degree of fusion; and thus, that they might be traced back to the primary settlements of the Indo-Germanic family.

In maintaining the composite structure of the Latin language, I assert also that the different elements, of which it is made up, are to be found in the fragmentary languages which have come down to us. When Lepsius proposed (*de Tabulis Eugubinis*, pp. 102, 105) to defend the thesis: *Latinam linguam non esse mixtam*, he must have had in view, either an opposition to the doctrine that Latin may be divided into a Greek and non-Greek part, which Lassen calls one-sided and erroneous, for we might as well speak of the German and non-German, or the Indian and non-Indian parts of Latin (*Rhein. Mus.* 1833, p. 361); or else a confutation of one of those untenable theories, which represent this language as an

imperfectly combined assemblage of heterogeneous ingredients. Admitting that in Italy, as in other peninsulas and islands of Europe, there must have been a Celtic substratum, this book undertakes to prove that the old Italian tribes were either Sclavonians, Low-Germans, or that well-fused compound of these two, the Lithuanians. Thus all the elements were homogeneous, and a perfect combination or absorption of idioms was a natural result of the political centralisation occasioned by the conquests of the Imperial City on the Tiber.

In order to arrive at this conclusion, it was necessary to examine all the details of Italian ethnography; and I am quite sure that, if Niebuhr thought a long series of essays on the old tribes of the Peninsula a proper introduction to his researches in Roman history, a similar investigation, supported by an analysis of the linguistic fragments, must be a still more indispensable preliminary to a treatise on Latin philology.

To complete the ethnographical portion of this work, I have drawn up a map of ancient Italy, which may also serve as a specimen of the best method, as it appears to me, of representing in a geographical form the results of philological and historical researches respecting the origin and changes of population in a particular district. Maps like those of Berghaus do indeed exhibit the area and boundaries of a nation or language at a given time; but the only ethnographical map, which can really assist the student's memory, is one which shows to the eye the origin and affinities of the different elements in the population of a country. To effect this, I have not only given, if I may say so, a section of the

various strata, but I have so chosen the colours, as to indicate their structure and relationship. As I believe that the Greeks and Celts—like the Teutones and Cimbri of history—were scions ultimately of the same stock, I have represented them by cognate colours—*red* and *pink;* and then, taking *yellow* to mark the Sclavonians and *blue* to indicate the Gothic tribes, the fusion of these races in the Lithuanian or Latin is shown to the eye by a stratum of *green*, which is a mixture of *blue* and *yellow*.

The former edition of this book, though complete with reference to its immediate object, was merely a review of existing knowledge, extended by suggestions and materials for further researches. The present republication endeavours to fill up the outline, which was thus presented. It will be found, therefore, that there is much more of enlargement than of alteration in the book as it now appears. Scarcely any chapter is without considerable and important additions, and I have thought it right to insert four new chapters, containing a full discussion of some subjects, which received only an incidental notice in the former edition. In fact, I have not intentionally omitted an examination of any important or difficult question connected with the ethnography of ancient Italy, or with the higher departments of Latin etymology and grammar[1]. With regard to the great

[1] In regard to all discussions in the present Volume, which bear immediately on the practical study of the Latin language, I should wish this work to be considered as a sequel to the Latin Grammar and Exercises which were published a few months since. Teachers will, I hope, find that I have fully explained and justified my departure from the traditionary, and, as it appears to me, erroneous method so long pursued in our classical schools.

philological problem,—the origin of the Etruscans and the nature of their language,—I think that I have so far extended and confirmed the theory, which I laid before the British Association in 1851, that it may now claim formal recognition as a discovery resting firmly on inductive evidence.

In reprinting this volume, I have felt much distrust of my ability to do all that I wished with the book; but I have no want of confidence in the soundness of the principles, which support it, or in the certainty of the results, to which it leads; and I believe that, whatever may be its defects, this work will contribute, in some degree, to facilitate and promote an important branch of those studies, to which I have devoted the best years of my life.

J. W. D.

Bury St. Edmund's,
November 6, 1852.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

NO person who is conversant with the subject will venture to assert that Latin scholarship is at present flourishing in England[1]. On the contrary, it must be admitted that, while we have lost that practical familiarity with the Latin language, which was possessed some forty years ago by every Englishman with any pretensions to scholarship, we have not supplied the deficiency by making ourselves acquainted with the results of modern philology, so far as they have been brought to bear upon the language and literature of ancient Rome. The same impulse, which has increased and extended our knowledge of Greek, has checked and impoverished our Latinity. The discovery that the Greek is, after all, an easier language than the Latin, and that it may be learned without the aid of its sister idiom, while it has certainly enabled many to penetrate into the arcana of Greek criticism who must otherwise have stopt at the threshold, has at the same time prevented many from facing the difficulties which surround the less attractive literature of Rome, and, by removing one reason for learning Latin, has induced the student to overlook the other and higher considerations which must always confer upon this language its value, its importance, and its dignity.

A return to the Latin scholarship of our ancestors can only be effected by a revival of certain old-fashioned methods and usages, which have been abandoned, perhaps more hastily than wisely, in favour of new habits and new

[1] See the Postscript at the end of this Preface.

theories. No arguments can make it fashionable for scholars to clothe their thoughts in a classic garb: example will do more than precept; and when some English philologer of sufficient authority shall acquire and exert the faculty of writing Latin with terse and simple elegance, he will not want imitators and followers. With regard, however, to our ignorance of modern Latin philology, it must be owned that our younger students have at least one excuse—namely, that they have no manual of instruction; no means of learning what has been done and is still doing in the higher departments of Italian philology; and if we may judge from the want of information on these subjects which is so frequently conspicuous in the works of our learned authors, our literary travellers, and our classical commentators, this deficiency is deeply rooted, and has been long and sensibly felt. Even those among us who have access to the stores of German literature, would seek in vain for a single book which might serve as the groundwork of their studies in this department. The most comprehensive Roman histories, and the most elaborate Latin grammars, do not satisfy the curiosity of the inquisitive student; and though there is already before the world a great mass of materials, these are scattered through the voluminous works of German and Italian scholars, and are, therefore, of little use to him who is not prepared to select for himself what is really valuable, and to throw aside the crude speculations and vague conjectures by which such researches are too often encumbered and deformed.

These considerations, and the advice of some friends, who have supposed that I might not be unprepared for such an office, have induced me to undertake the work which is now presented to the English student. How far I have accomplished my design must be left to the judg-

ment of others. It has been my wish to produce, within as short a compass as possible, a complete and systematic treatise on the origin of the Romans, and the structure and affinities of their language,—a work which, while it might be practically useful to the intelligent and educated traveller in Italy, no less than to the reader of Niebuhr and Arnold, might at the same time furnish a few specimens and samples of those deeper researches, the full prosecution of which is reserved for a chosen few.

The most cursory inspection of the table of contents will show what is the plan of the book, and what information it professes to give. Most earnestly do I hope that it may contribute in some degree to awaken among my countrymen a more thoughtful and manly spirit of Latin philology. In proportion as it effects this object, I shall feel myself excused in having thus ventured to commit to a distant press a work necessarily composed amid the distractions and interruptions of a laborious and engrossing profession.

J. W. D.

The School Hall, Bury St. Edmund's,
25*th March*, 1844.

POSTSCRIPT, 1852.

On the Causes and Remedies of the present neglect of Latin Scholarship in England.

IN the first sentence of the preceding Preface, I have stated my belief that Latin Scholarship is not flourishing in England, and this statement was repeated in the preface to the Latin Grammar, which was published in January last. On each appearance of this assertion, I was obliged to defend it from direct attacks on the part of those who felt themselves aggrieved by it. My first assailant was the principal of an educational establishment connected with University College, London, who regarded himself as a champion of "crude-form" philology. My second opponent was the Master of an endowed Grammar School, who came forward as a vindicator of old-fashioned Latinity. But they both agreed in the personality of their opposition to a censure of English Scholarship, which they conceived to be in some measure directed against themselves. The former controversialist gave no indication of superior knowledge or ability, and as a *clamosus mercium undique compilatarum venditator*, his egotism and presumption would have been simply ridiculous, had not his disregard of those principles, which regulate the conduct of honourable men, suggested some considerations affecting himself of a graver and more painful nature. The second defender of English Latinity needs no testimony from me to his respectability and moral worth, and he is an excellent Greek scholar, if brilliant success at the University may be taken as a criterion; but his pamphlet was chiefly remarkable as showing how unconsciously our best men can

put forth and maintain obsolete and erroneous doctrines in Latin grammar and philology. Whatever other effect these discussions may have produced, they have at least failed to change my opinions respecting the Latin Scholarship of this country. But when I adhere to and repeat those opinions, I do not wish to inquire whether any other persons are disposed to contradict or censure me; I do not ask, with Macaulay's Horatius,

> "What noble Lucumo comes next
> To taste our Roman cheer?"

Personal considerations do not enter into a general criticism which includes a whole department of classical learning. Even if I could, without presumption, enumerate those whom I consider as exceptions to the laxity of our Latin Scholarship, I should be deterred by the fear of omitting many whose attainments are unknown to me; and I feel assured that, while there are always some who will defend the faults which they exemplify, all those, who are really good scholars, will readily admit the comparative neglect into which the study of the Latin language has fallen among us; and with regard to those who are less conscious of it, I shall hope to point out some of the causes and remedies of our deficiency in this respect, without provoking a contest, which, like those already referred to, might enable me to gain an easy triumph at the expense of some individual.

Latin Scholarship is in a low state among us, because we have abandoned the old inducements to this study, without taking up the new applications which give it an increased interest and value. For the fact, it is sufficient to mention that, although our public schools impart a facility in the composition of Latin verse, which is rarely attained on the continent, and though this is highly valuable as a practical habit of skill and accuracy, examiners

at the Universities and bishops at their ordinations have publicly complained that they very rarely meet with a young man who can write tolerably good Latin prose. And among our maturer scholars, while some cannot write a page without inaccuracy, there are certainly not many whose Latin style will bear a comparison with that of Ernesti, Ruhnken, Garatoni, F. A. Wolf, and Wyttenbach. Then again, although the present generation of our scholars can point to publications of the Greek authors and lexicographers, at least equal to the best specimens of the kind which have appeared on the continent, we have produced no edition of a Latin work, which can be mentioned in the same breath with Orelli's *Horace*, Lachmann's *Lucretius*, Ritschl's *Plautus*, and the *Varro* and *Festus* of C. O. Müller; still less can we claim to have done any thing for the classical study of the Roman law, which deserves to be placed beside the labours of Haubold, Dirksen, Hugo, and Savigny.

There can be no doubt that the proper remedy for this comparative neglect of Latin Scholarship, is to increase or revive the demand for a knowledge of Latin, and to point out to amateur or dilettanti students the real interest and practical value of this branch of classical learning. This will amount to a resumption on the one hand, of "certain old-fashioned methods and usages" (above, p. ix.), and will involve, on the other hand, a proper cultivation of modern Latin philology in all its applications.

An increased or revived demand for Latin Scholarship will be promoted, if the Universities allow it to be seen that the rewards and honours, which they have to bestow, are at least as attainable by this means, as by an accurate and critical acquaintance with Attic Greek. At present it is well known, that, although the examinations at Oxford

and Cambridge presume an equal attention to Latin and Greek on the part of the candidates for classical honours, practically it is not expected or required that the former language should have been studied with the same minute and scrupulous regard to its texture and idioms. This is shown, in part, by the direct or presumed references to the works of those critics who have written on the Greek language, and by the absence of any similar appeal to the writings of the great Latin scholars. It is required, for example, that the competitor should be familiar with what Porson, Elmsley, and Hermann have written on the text of Euripides, but it is not implied that he must have studied the notes of Drakenborch on Livy, or the miscellaneous observations of Gronovius. During my long residence at one of the Universities, I knew more than one case in which a high place in the Tripos was perilled by an error in Greek syntax or metre, and I was informed of one instance in which the most distinguished classical honours were awarded to a youth, whose knowledge of Latin was so confused and uncertain that he had construed *ventos* as the passive participle of *venio*. When University students know that their examiners value and exact as scholarlike and critical an acquaintance with the best Latin, as with the best Greek authors, they will not fail to bring their industry and talents to bear on the neglected literature of Rome. It might be desirable that our Universities should require the use of the Latin language in all books of a strictly learned character, which are published at their expense. At any rate, great advantages would be gained if all theological works of a higher class were clothed in this classic garb. Religious newspapers and other periodicals conducted by unlearned and anonymous writers, who are only anxious to fan the flame of one-sided prejudice, would lose much of their fuel, if

original and well-informed divines, who are anxious to elicit the truth, which lies mid-way between the opinions of extreme parties, were content to write *ad clerum* in the first instance. And I should rejoice, if among the contemplated reforms of our Universities, we could revive the discipline of our divinity schools, strenuously refusing the honours of the highest faculty to all who cannot maintain a disputation in precise and accurate Latinity[1].

To increase a more general interest in the philological study of the Latin language, we must begin by engaging professed scholars in a proper regard for Roman literature. This will be best effected, if they can be induced to believe that there is still the same room for the display of their abilities and learning in the revision and illustration of the Latin authors, as in their favourite field of Greek criticism. Not to speak of Cicero, many of whose works expect a competent editor acquainted with the highest philology of the day, there is ample opportunity for criticism of the best kind in the proper interpretation of Plautus, Lucretius, Propertius, Virgil, Livy, and Tacitus. Then again we may hope that the general ethnographer and philologer will be more and more persuaded that ancient Italy furnishes the most difficult as well as the most important subject for his speculations. If the new combinations in this work are as valid and conclusive as I believe them to be, a true explanation of even the com-

[1] As undergraduates were expected to hold Latin disputations in the schools, the Universities must have assumed that they would come up perfectly able to carry on a conversation in Latin. The *Grammar* schools were instituted expressly for this purpose (see *New Crat.* § 83), and the old statutes of Bury School direct that "the scholars shall speak continually Latin as well without the school as within." The presumption that Latin will be sufficiently learned before the commencement of a college career is farther indicated by the fact, that neither of our great Universities has a Professor of *Humanity* or Latin.

monest and most striking peculiarities of Latin word-forms was hitherto undiscovered. In those great seats of learning, where the luxury of study may be enjoyed for its own sake, it is to be regretted that we have no lectures on the Romance languages, which are so deserving of the attention of all those whose ancestors, in part or wholly, adopted them, and which lend a new interest to the study of the Latin language, their immediate parent. Above all, the cultivation of Roman literature will never be restored to its proper place in the estimation of learned Englishmen, until we have revived the classical spirit, which formerly prevailed in this country, and which, on the continent, still directs and influences the study of the civil law. On this subject, I shall take the liberty of quoting the words of a writer, with whom I do not often agree, and whose Latin scholarship is by no means an exception to the general rule of laxity and incompleteness, but who has enjoyed, as I have, the advantage of a regular and prolonged course of legal study; and I am the more induced to quote his words, because, as he has been a public teacher both of Latin and of law, his admissions may be received as partly affecting himself: "That in this country, where we profess to cultivate ancient learning, we should so long have neglected the study of the Roman law, the best and only original part of their literature, and should have gone on in the dark, admiring and thinking that we understood the writings of Cicero, our model of Latinity, is a proof, the strongest possible, of the degradation into which classical studies have sunk in our higher places of education. In one University, lectures on the civil law have ceased to be given, though there is still a Professor; and in the other (Cambridge), though lectures are given, and degrees are taken in civil law, it is well known in how little estimation both the subject itself and the de-

grees are held by those who follow what may be called the regular studies of the University. Instead of the lectures on civil law being considered as auxiliary to and part of the Latin studies of the University, which they ought to be and might be, an attendance on the course of civil law, and a residence in the Hall where the lectures are delivered, are generally viewed rather as a convenient means of obtaining a degree. Such being the case, it would not be an easy matter for the Professor to restore the study of the civil law to its proper dignity, and to make it an integral part of the University course[1]." It cannot be denied that there is some general truth in these remarks; but the writer overestimates the difficulty of remedying the defects of which he complains. Whenever the subject of civil law shall be taken up by some genuine Latin scholar fully impressed with its dignity and importance, he will form a school for himself; and to say nothing of my own University, I may be permitted to remark, that the fabric of juristic learning, which an eminent civilian at Oxford has built upon a solid foundation of classical scholarship, not unconnected with a careful study of Niebuhr, may lead us to believe that there are already some persons in England who can bring to the study of the Roman law the thoughtful erudition of Gibbon and the philological acuteness of Savigny.

On the whole, though I feel myself obliged on this occasion to repeat the preface to *Varronianus*, as it originally stood, I venture to indulge in the hope that, if I live long enough to write again on this subject, I shall be able to speak in more flattering terms of the Latin Scholarship of England.

---

[1] *Central Society of Education.* Third Publication, p. 220.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

THE OLD ITALIAN TRIBES CONSIDERED AS RELATED TO EACH OTHER.

SECT.		PAGE
1	Elements of the population of Rome	1
2	The LATINS—a composite tribe	3
3	The Oscans, &c.	3
4	Alba and Lavinium	5
5	Trojan colony in Latium	6
6	The SABINES—how related to the Umbrians and Oscans	7
7	The Umbrians—their ancient greatness	8
8	Reduced to insignificance by successive contacts with the Tyrrheno-Pelasgians and Etruscans	9
9	The PELASGIANS—the differences of their position in Italy and Greece respectively	10
10	They preserve their national integrity in Etruria	11
11	Meaning and extent of the name "Tyrrhenian"	11
12	The ETRUSCANS—the author's theory respecting their origin	14
13	The names ETRUSCUS and RASENA cannot be brought to an agreement with TYRSENUS	16
14	It is explicitly stated by ancient writers that the Etruscans came from Rætia	17
15	This view of the case is after all the most reasonable	18
16	It is confirmed by all available evidence, and especially by the contrast between the town and country languages of Etruria	19
17	Farther inferences derivable from (*a*) the traditionary history of the Luceres	21
18	(*b*) Fragmentary records of the early constitution of Rome	23
19	(*c*) Etymology of some mythical proper names	24
20	General conclusion as to the mutual relations of the old Italian tribes	26

CHAPTER II.

THE FOREIGN AFFINITIES OF THE ANCIENT ITALIANS.

1	Etymology of the word Πελασγός	28
2	How the Pelasgians came into Europe	30

SECT.		PAGE
3	Inferences derivable from the contrast of Pelasgian and Hellenic architecture	31
4	Supported by deductions from the contrasted mythology of the two races	36
5	Thracians, Getæ, and Scythians	39
6	Scythians and Medes	40
7	Iranian origin of the Sarmatians, Scythians, and Getæ, may be shown (1) generally, and (2) by an examination of the remains of the Scythian language	40
8	Mode of discriminating the ethnical elements in this chain of nations	42
9	Peculiarities of the Scythian language suggested by Aristophanes	44
10	Names of the Scythian rivers derived and explained	45
11	Names of the Scythian divinities	48
12	Other Scythian words explained	52
13	Successive peopling of Asia and Europe: fate of the Mongolian race	55
14	The Pelasgians were of Sclavonian origin	58
15	Foreign affinities of the Umbrians, &c.	59
16	Reasons for believing that they were the same race as the Lithuanians	59
17	Farther confirmation from etymology	61
18	Celtic tribes intermixed with the Sclavonians and Lithuanians in Italy and elsewhere	62
19	The Sarmatæ probably a branch of the Lithuanian family	64
20	Gothic or Low-German affinities of the ancient Etruscans shown by their ethnographic opposition to the Veneti	66
21	Reasons for comparing the old Etruscan with the Old Norse	68
22	Old Norse explanations of Etruscan proper names	69
23	Contacts and contrasts of the Semitic and the Sclavonian	72
24	Predominant Sclavonism of the old Italian languages	74

CHAPTER III.

THE UMBRIAN LANGUAGE AS EXHIBITED IN THE EUGUBINE TABLES.

1	The Eugubine Tables	78
2	Peculiarities by which the old Italian alphabets were distinguished	79
3	The Sibilants	80
4	Some remarks on the other letters	82
5	Umbrian grammatical forms	83
6	Selections from the Eugubine Tables, with explanations: Tab. I. a, 1.	86

SECT.		PAGE
7	Tab. I. a, 2-6	89
8	Tab. I. b, 13, sqq.	94
9	Extracts from the Litany in Tab. VI. a	96
10	Umbrian words which approximate to their Latin synonyms	99
11	The Todi Inscription contains four words of the same class	101

CHAPTER IV.

THE SABELLO-OSCAN LANGUAGE.

1	The remains of the Oscan language must be considered as Sabellian also	104
2	Alphabetical List of Sabello-Oscan words, with their interpretation	105
3	The Bantine Table	116
4	Commentary on the Bantine Table	119
5	The Cippus Abellanus	127
6	The bronze tablet of Agnone	130
7	The Atellanæ	132

CHAPTER V.

THE ETRUSCAN LANGUAGE.

1	Transcriptions of proper names the first clue to an interpretation of the Etruscan language	139
2	Names of Etruscan divinities derived and explained	143
3	Alphabetical list of Etruscan words interpreted	151
4	Etruscan Inscriptions—difficulties attending their interpretation	165
5	Inscriptions in which the Pelasgian element predominates	166
6	Transition to the inscriptions which contain Scandinavian words. The laurel-crowned Apollo. Explanation of the words CLAN and PHLERES	170
7	Inscriptions containing the words SUTHI and TRCE	174
8	Inferences derivable from the words SVER, CVER, and THUR or THAUR	176
9	Striking coincidence between the Etruscan and Old Norse in the use of the auxiliary verb LATA	177
10	The great Perugian Inscription critically examined—its Runic affinities	180
11	Harmony between linguistic research and ethnographic tradition in regard to the ancient Etruscans	189
12	General remarks on the absorption or evanescence of the old Etruscan language	191

CHAPTER VI.

THE OLD ROMAN OR LATIN LANGUAGE.

SECT.		PAGE
1	Fragments of old Latin not very numerous	193
2	Arvalian Litany	194
3	Chants preserved by Cato	196
4	Fragments of Salian hymns	197
5	Old regal laws	200
6	Remains of the XII. Tables	203
7	Table I.	203
8	Table II.	205
9	Table III.	207
10	Table IV.	208
11	Table V.	209
12	Table VI.	210
13	Table VII.	212
14	Table VIII.	214
15	Table IX.	217
16	Table X.	218
17	Table XI.	219
18	Table XII.	219
19	The Tiburtine Inscription	220
20	The Epitaphs of the Scipios	222
21	The *Columna Rostrata*	229
22	The Silian and Papirian laws, and the Edict of the curule Ædiles	230
23	The *Senatus-Consultum de Bacchanalibus*	232
24	The old Roman law on the Bantine Table	234

CHAPTER VII.

ANALYSIS OF THE LATIN ALPHABET.

1	Organic classification of the original Latin Alphabet	238
2	The labials	239
3	The gutturals	245
4	The dentals	254
5	The vowels	260
6	The Greek letters used by the Romans	267
7	The numeral signs	272

CHAPTER VIII.

THE LATIN CASE-SYSTEM.

SECT.		PAGE
1	Fulness and deficiencies of the Latin case-system	274
2	General scheme of the case-endings	275
3	Differences of crude-form	276
4	Hypothetical forms of the nominative and accusative plural	278
5	Existing forms—the genitive	280
6	The dative and locative	282
7	The accusative singular	283
8	The ablative	284
9	The neuter forms	284
10	The vocative	286
11	Adverbs considered as cases of nouns	287
12	Adverbial expression for the day of the month	292

CHAPTER IX.

DECLENSIONS OF THE LATIN NOUN.

1	The usual arrangement is erroneous	293
2	General rules for the classification of Latin nouns	294
3	First or *-a* Declension	295
4	Second or *-o* Declension	296
5	Third Declension or consonantal nouns	296
6	A. First class or purely consonantal nouns	297
7	B. Second class or semi-consonantal nouns	301

CHAPTER X.

PRONOUNS AND PRONOMINAL WORDS.

1	General definitions	307
2	Personal Pronouns	307
3	Indicative Pronouns	310
4	Distinctive Pronouns	315
5	Relative, interrogative, and indefinite Pronouns	318
6	Numerals and Degrees of Comparison	327
7	Prepositions	329
8	Negative particles	337

CHAPTER XI.

THE THEORY OF THE LATIN VERB.

SECT.		PAGE
1	The Latin verb generally defective	341
2	The personal inflexions—their consistent anomalies	341
3	Doctrine of the Latin tenses	343
4	The substantive verbs	345
5	Paucity of organic formations in the regular Latin verb	350
6	General scheme of tenses in the Latin verb	351
7	Verbs which may be regarded as parathetic compounds	352
8	Tenses of the vowel-verbs which are combinations of the same kind	353
9	Organic derivation of the tenses in the consonant verb	355
10	Auxiliary tenses of the passive voice	355
11	The modal distinctions—their syntax	356
12	Forms of the infinitive and participle—how connected in derivation and meaning	359
13	The *gerundium* and *gerundivum* shown to be active and present	361
14	The participle in *-tūrus*	365
15	The Perfect Subjunctive	365
16	The past tense of the infinitive active	369

CHAPTER XII.

THE LATIN CONJUGATIONS.

1	The conjugations are regulated by the same principles as the declensions	372
2	The first or *-a* conjugation	373
3	The second or *-e* conjugation	377
4	The third or *-i* conjugation	382
5	The fourth or consonant conjugation. A. Mute verbs	384
6	B. Liquid verbs	388
7	C. Semi-consonantal verbs	390
8	Irregular verbs. A. Additions to the present tense	391
9	B. Abbreviated forms	397
10	Defective verbs	399

CHAPTER XIII.

DERIVATION AND COMPOSITION.

1	A. Derivation. General principles	400
2	Derivation is merely extended or ulterior inflexion	401

SECT.		PAGE
3	I. Derived nouns	402
4	(*a*) Forms with the first Pronominal Element only	402
5	(*b*) Forms with the second Pronominal Element only	403
6	(*c*) Forms with the third Pronominal Element only	405
7	(*a*) Terminations compounded of the first and other Pronominal Elements	405
8	(*β*) Terminations compounded of the second and other Pronominal Elements	406
9	(*γ*) The third Pronominal Element, compounded with others and reduplicated	417
10	II. Derived verbs	419
11	B. Composition. Discrimination of compound words	424
12	Classification of Latin compounds	426

CHAPTER XIV.

CONSTITUTION AND PATHOLOGY OF THE LATIN LANGUAGE.

1	Genius of the Latin Language	432
2	Abbreviations observable in the written forms	433
3	Ancient testimonies to the difference between the spoken and the written language	437
4	The poetry of the Augustan age does not represent the genuine Latin pronunciation	439
5	Which is rather to be derived from an examination of the comic metres	440
6	The French language is the best modern representative of the spoken Latin	444
7	The modern Italian not equally so; and why	447
8	Different dialects of the French language	448
9	But all these dialects were closely related to the Latin	451
10	Leading distinctions between the Roman and Romance idioms	453
11	Importance and value of the Latin Language	458

ERRATA.

Page 25, line 25, *for* suiters *read* suitors.

„ 75, „ 34, *for* granst *read* graust.

„ 364, „ 7, *Add* "That these attributive usages really correspond to active infinitives even in those cases, in which the gerundive might be referred to a passive verb, as in: *vir minime contemnendus*, &c., appears from Greek phrases like: *οὐ πάνυ μοίρας εὐδαιμονίσαι πρώτης* (Soph. *Œd. Col.* 142)."

„ 382, penult, *for* Metium *read* Mettum. Those who look to such minutiæ will observe an inconsistency in the spelling of verbs in *-ise* or *-ize*; I write them uniformly with *s*; the printer seems to prefer *z*, and I have not always insisted on my own orthography.

VARRONIANUS.

CHAPTER I.

THE OLD ITALIAN TRIBES CONSIDERED AS RELATED TO EACH OTHER.

§ 1. Elements of the population of Rome. § 2. The LATINS—a composite tribe. § 3. The Oscans, &c. § 4. Alba and Lavinium. § 5. Trojan colony in Latium. § 6. The SABINES—how related to the Umbrians and Oscans. § 7. The Umbrians—their ancient greatness. § 8. Reduced to insignificance by successive contacts with the Tyrrheno-Pelasgians and Etruscans. § 9. The PELASGIANS—the differences of their position in Italy and Greece respectively. § 10. They preserve their national integrity in Etruria. § 11. Meaning and ethnical extent of the name "Tyrrhenian." § 12. The ETRUSCANS—the author's theory respecting their origin. § 13. The names *Etruscus* and *Rasena* cannot be brought to an agreement with *Tyrsenus*. § 14. It is explicitly stated by ancient writers that the Etruscans came from Rætia. § 15. This view of the case is after all the most reasonable. § 16. It is confirmed by all available evidence, and especially by the contrast between the town and country language of ancient Etruria. § 17. Further inferences derivable from (*a*) the traditionary history of the Luceres. § 18. (*b*) Fragmentary records of the early constitution of Rome. § 19. (*c*) Etymology of some mythical proper names. § 20. General conclusion as to the mutual relations of the old Italian tribes.

§ 1. *Elements of the population of Rome.*

THE sum of all that is known of the earliest history of Rome is comprised in the following enumeration of particulars. A tribe of Latin origin, more or less connected with Alba, settled on the Palatine hill, and in the process of time united itself, by the right of intermarriage and other ties, with a band of Sabine warriors, who had taken up their abode on the Quirinal and Capitoline hills. These two towns admitted into fellowship with themselves a third community, established on the Cælian and Esquiline hills, which seems to have consisted of Pelasgians, either from the Solonian plain lying between Rome and Lavinium, or from the opposite side of the river near Cære; and the whole body became one city, governed by a king, or *magister populi*, and a senate; the latter being the representatives of the

three original elements of the state,—the Latin or Oscan Ramnes, the Sabine Titienses or Quirites, and the Pelasgian Luceres. It appears, moreover, that the Etruscans, on the other side of the Tiber, eventually influenced the destinies of Rome in no slight degree, and the last three kings mentioned in the legendary traditions were of Etruscan origin. In other words, Rome was, during the period referred to by their reigns, subjected to a powerful Etruscan dynasty, from the tyranny of which it had, on two occasions, the good fortune to escape. What Servius planned was for the most part carried into effect by the consular constitution, which followed the expulsion of the last Tarquinius.

As these facts are established by satisfactory evidence, and as we have nothing else on which we can depend with certainty, it follows that in order to investigate the ethnical affinities of the Roman people, and the origin and growth of their language, we must in the first instance inquire who were the Latins, the Sabines, the Pelasgians, and the Etruscans, and what were their relations one with another. After this we shall be able with greater accuracy to examine their respective connexions with the several elements in the original population of Europe.

The general result will be this :—that the *Septimontium*, or seven Hills of Rome, contained a miniature representation of the ethnography of the whole Peninsula. Leaving out of the question the Celtic substratum, which cannot be ascertained, but which was probably most pure in the mountaineers of the Apennines, the original population of Italy from the Po to the straits of Rhegium was, like that of ancient Greece, Pelasgo-Sclavonian. This population remained unadulterated up to the dawn of ancient history in the central plains to the West—namely, in Etruria and Latium, but in the rest of Italy it was superseded or absorbed or qualified in different degrees of fusion by a population of Gothic or Low-German origin, which, although undoubtedly of later introduction in the Peninsula, was so mixed up with the Celtic or primary tribes that it claimed to be aboriginal. When this Low-German race remained tolerably pure, or at least only infected with Celtic ingredients, it bore the names of Umbrians or Ombricans in the North, and of Opicans or Oscans in the South. When it was intermixed with Sclavonic elements to about the same extent as the Lithuanians or Old Prussians in the North of Europe, this Low-German population became

known as Latins and Sabines. And the Etruscans or Rasena were a later and uninfected importation of Low Germans fresh from the North, who conquered and were partly absorbed into the pure Tyrrhenians, or Pelasgo-Sclavonians to the right of the Tiber.

§ 2. *The* Latins—*a composite tribe.*

The investigations of Niebuhr and others have made it sufficiently certain that the Pelasgians formed a very important element in the population of ancient Latium. This appears not merely from the primitive traditions, but also, and more strongly, from the mythology, language, and architecture of the country. It has likewise been proved that this Pelasgian population was at an early period partially conquered by a tribe of mountaineers, who are called *Oscans,* and who descended on Latium from the basins of the Nar and the Velinus. The influence of these foreign invaders was most sensibly and durably felt in the language of the country; which in its earliest form presents phenomena not unlike those which have marked the idiom spoken in this island since the Norman conquest. The words relating to husbandry and peaceful life are Pelasgian, and the terms of war and the chase are Oscan[1].

As it is this foreign element which forms the distinction between the Latins and the Pelasgians, let us in the first place inquire into the origin and affinities of these Oscan conquerors, in order that we may more easily disentangle the complexities of the subject.

§ 3. *The Oscans, &c.*

The Oscans were known at different times and in different places under the various names of Opicans, Opscans, Ausonians,

---

[1] Niebuhr, *H. R.* I. p. 82. Müller, *Etrusker,* I. p. 17. This observation must not be pressed too far; for it does not in fact amount to more than *prima facie* evidence. The Opican or Oscan language belongs to the Indo-Germanic family no less than the Pelasgian; the latter, however, was one ingredient in the language of ancient Greece, and it does not appear that any Hellenic tribes were connected with the Oscans; consequently it is fair to say that, as one element in the Latin language resembles the Greek, while the other does not, the Græcising element is Pelasgian.

and Auruncans. The primary denomination was *Op-icus* or *Oqu-icus*, derived from *Ops* or *Opis* = *Oqu-is*, the Italian name of the goddess *Earth;* and these people were therefore, in accordance with their name, the *Autochthones*, or aboriginal inhabitants of the district where they are first found. The other denominations are derived from the same word, *Op-s* = *Oqu-is*, by the addition of the endings *-si-cus*, *-sunus*, and *-sun-icus*. The guttural is assimilated in *Oscus*, the labial is absorbed in Αὔσων, and the *s* has become *r*, according to the regular process, in *Auruncus*[1].

---

[1] See Niebuhr, I. 69, note. Buttmann, *Lexilogus*, I. p. 68, note 1. (p. 154, Fishlake). The investigation of these names leads to a variety of important and interesting results. It has been shown elsewhere that in the oldest languages of the Indo-Germanic family the names of the cow or ox and the earth are commutable (*N. Crat.* § 470). Not to refer to the obvious but not so certain analogy between Ἄπις, the ox-god, and the ἀπίη γαῖα, it can be shown to demonstration that the steer or ox, which was to the last the symbol of the old Italians, as appears by their coins, entered into the meaning of their two national designations, *Italus* and *Opicus*. With regard to the former it is well known, that *italos*, or *itulus*, or with the digamma *vitulus*, meant an ox or steer (Niebuhr, I. 18 sqq.), and *Vitellium* appears on coins as a synonym for *Italia*. This takes us at once to the Gothic *vithrus*, O. N. *vedr*, O. S. *withar*, Anglo-S. *vether*, O. H. G. *vidar*, N. H. G. *widder* (properly the castrated animal), English *wether;* and as these are referred to sheep rather than oxen, we must conclude that the name is an epithet which is applicable to either animal. With regard to the other root, *qv* in *Æquus* carries us back to the principle of combined but divergent articulations, to which I first called attention (*N. Crat.* § 110), and on which the late Mr. Garnett wrote some valuable papers (*Philol. Soc.* II. p. 233, 257 al.), and we may infer that the roots *ap-* or *op-* present a labial only instead of an original combination of labial and guttural, while we find the opposite divergence in the guttural forms *vac-ca*, *veh-o*, Sanscr. *vaha*, Gr. ὄχος, ἔχω, Goth. *auh-sa*, O. N. *ox*, Anglo-S. *oxa*, O. H. G. *ohso*, N. H. G. *ochs*, Engl. *ox*. The labial form is sometimes strengthened by an inserted *anusvára*, or homogeneous liquid; thus by the side of ὀπ-ώρα and *op-s* we have ὀ-μ-φύνειν· αὔξειν. Hesych. Cf. ὀπ-ώρα, *auc-tumnus* (where the root αὐξ-, *auc-*, *aug-eo* contains the guttural form of this element) and ὀ-μ-πη· εὐθηνία ὅθεν καὶ ἡ Δημήτηρ Ὀ-μ-πνία. With these remarks we shall have no difficulty in reducing to one origin and classifying the different Italian names into which the root *oqu-* enters. The *qu-* is found only in *Æqu-us;* the *p* appears in *Op-icus*, *Ap-ulus;* the guttural is assimilated in *Oscus* = *Ok-scus* (cf. δί-σκος for δίκ-σκος, λέ-σχη for λέγ-σκη &c. *N. Crat.* § 219); the labial

These aboriginal tribes, having been in the first instance, like the Arcadians in the Peloponnese, driven by their invaders, the Pelasgians, into the mountain fastnesses of the Apennines, were at length reinforced by foreign elements, and descending from the interior on both sides, conquered the people of the plains and the coast. One tribe, the *Ap-uli*, subdued the Daunians and other tribes settled in the south-east, and gave their name to the country; they also extended themselves to the west, and became masters of the country from the bay of Terracina upwards to the Tiber. In this district they bore the well-known names of *Volsci* and *Æqui*, names still connected with the primary designation of the aborigines.

A more important invasion was that which was occasioned by the pressure of the Sabines on an Oscan people settled in the mountains between Reate and the Fucine lake. These invaders came down the Anio, and conquered the Pelasgians of northern Latium. Their chief seat in the conquered country seems to have been Alba, the *Alp*-ine or mountain-city, where they dwelt under the name of *Prisci Latini*, "ancient Latins;" being also called *Casci*, a name which denotes "ancient" or "well-born," and which, like the connected Greek term χαοί, implies that they were a nation of warriors (*N. Crat.* § 322).

§ 4. *Alba and Lavinium.*

The district of Latium, when history first speaks of it, was thus occupied by two races; one a mixed people of Oscan con-

---

is vocalized in *Au-son;* the *s* of the termination is changed into *r*, according to the old Italian practice, in *Au-runcus* = *Au-sunicus;* and the root-consonant is represented only by an initial *v* in *Volscus* = *Apulisicus*, which has vanished, as usual, in the Hellenic articulation Ἐλίσυκος (Herod. VII. 165). It will be seen in the sequel that I seek a very different origin for the name *Umbria*, which Niebuhr apparently refers to this root: and it seems very strange to me that he should have understood the statement of Philistus quoted by Dionysius (I. 22): ἐξαναστῆναι δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἑαυτῶν τοὺς Λίγυας ὑπό τε Ὀμβρικῶν καὶ Πελασγῶν, which refers to the dispossession of the Celtic inhabitants of Umbria and Etruria, as belonging to the same traditions which led Antiochus to write that the Sicilians were driven over into Sicily by the Opicans (*H. R.* I. p. 82): for Antiochus is speaking exclusively of what took place in the southern extremity of Italy, and the Pelasgians and Ombrici mentioned by Philistus were the Tyrrhenians and Umbrians of the north.

querors living in the midst of the Pelasgians whom they had subdued, the other a Pelasgian nation not yet conquered by the invaders. These two nations formed at first two distinct confederacies: of the former *Alba* was the head, while the place of congress for the latter was *Lavinium*. At the latter place, the *Penates*, or old Pelasgian *Cabeiri*, were worshipped; and even after the Pelasgian league was broken up by the power of Alba, and when Alba became the capital of the united nation of the Latins and sent a colony to Lavinium, the religious sanctity of the place was still maintained, the Penates were still worshipped there, and deputies still met in the temple of Venus. The influence of Alba was, however, so great, that even after its fall, when the Pelasgian Latins partially recovered their independence, there remained a large admixture of foreign elements in the whole population of Latium, and that which was purely Pelasgian in their character and institutions became gradually less and less perceptible, till nothing remained on the south of the Tiber which could claim exemption from the predominating influence of the Oscans.

That the name *Lavinium* is only a dialectical variety of *Latinium* has long been admitted. The original form of the name *Latinus*, which afterwards furnished a denomination for the language of the civilised world, was *Latvinus;* and while the Pelasgian Latins preserved the labial only, the mixed people retained only the dental[1].

§ 5. *Trojan Colony in Latium.*

The tradition speaks of the Pelasgian Latins as a colony of Trojans who settled on the coast under *Æneas*, the son of *Anchises*. Without entering at length into an examination of this poetical legend, it may be mentioned here that the names *Æneas* and *Anchises* refer, wherever they are found, to the Pelasgian or Cabeiric worship of water in general, and of the flowing stream in particular, and therefore indicate the presence of a Pelasgian population. We have other reasons for inferring the existence of Pelasgians on the coast of Asia Minor, in Thes-

[1] The same has been the case in the Pelasgian forms, *liber*, *libra*, *bis*, *ruber*, &c., compared with their Hellenic equivalents, *ἐ-λεύθερος*, *λίτρα*, *δίς*, *ἐ-ρυθρός*, &c.

saly, Bœotia, Arcadia, and the west of Italy. It is therefore quite natural that we should find in these localities the name of *Æneas* as that of a river or river-god. The word itself denotes "the ever-flowing" (αἰνείας or αἰνέας, ἄενναος, ἀεὶ or αἰεὶ νέων, cf. ἀμυνίας, ἀμύνων, *N. Crat.* § 262), and in accordance with this we have the rivers *Anias*, *Ænios*, *Ænus*, and *Anio*. In the same way, because the stream is the child of its fountain, *Anchises* the father of *Æneas*, whose mother is *Aphrodite*, the goddess of the sea-foam, denotes the outpouring of water (ἀγχίσης, ἀγχύσις, ἄγχεσμος, ἀγχοή, from ἀναχέω), and corresponds to *Fontus*, the *Jupiter Egerius* of the Romans[1].

§ 6. *The* Sabines—*how related to the Umbrians and Oscans.*

It has been mentioned that the Sabines dispossessed the Oscans, and compelled them to invade Latium. Our next point is, therefore, to consider the relation in which the Sabines stood to the circumjacent tribes.

The original abode of these Sabines was, according to Cato[2], about Amiternum, in the higher Apennines. Issuing from this lofty region, they drove the Umbrians before them on one side and the Oscans on the other, and so took possession of the district which for so many years was known by their name.

It will not be necessary in this place to point out the successive steps by which the Sabine colonies made themselves masters of the whole south and east of Italy, nor to show how they settled on two of the hills of Rome. It is clear, on every account, that they were not Pelasgians; and our principal object is to inquire how they stood related to the Umbrians and Oscans, on whom they more immediately pressed.

Niebuhr thinks it not improbable that the Sabines and Oscans were only branches of one stock, and mentions many reasons for supposing so[3]. It appears, however, that there are still stronger reasons for concluding that the Sabines were an

---

[1] For these and many other ingenious combinations more or less tenable, see *Troja's Ursprung, Blüthe, Untergang und Wiedergeburt in Latium*, von Emil Rückert, Hamb. u. Gotha, 1846.

[2] Quoted by Dionys. I. 14, p. 40; II. 49, p. 338. Reiske.

[3] *Hist. Rome*, I. p. 103.

offshoot of the Umbrian race. This is established not only by the testimony of Zenodotus of Trœzen[1], who wrote upon the Umbrians, but also by the resemblances of the Sabine and Umbrian languages[2]. It is true that this last remark may be made also with regard to the Sabine and Oscan idioms; for many words which are quoted as Sabine are likewise Oscan[3]. The most plausible theory is, that the Sabines were Umbrians, who were separated from the rest of their nation, and driven into the high Apennines, by the Pelasgians of the north-east; but that, after an interval, they in their turn assumed an offensive position, and descending from their highlands, under the name of *Sabini*, or "worshippers of Sabus the son of Sancus[4]," attacked their Umbrian brethren on the one side, and the Oscan Latins on the other. At length, however, they sent out so many colonies to the south, among the Oscan nations, that their Umbrian affinities were almost forgotten; and the Sabellian tribes, especially the Samnites, were regarded as members of the Oscan family, from having adopted to a considerable extent the language of the conquered tribes among whom they dwelt.

§ 7. *The Umbrians—their ancient greatness.*

The Umbrians are always mentioned as one of the most ancient nations of Italy[5]. Though restricted in the historical ages to the left bank of the Tiber, it is clear that in ancient times they occupied the entire northern half of the peninsula, from the Tiber to the Po. Their name, according to the Greek etymology, implied that they had existed before the great rain-

---

[1] Apud Dionys. II. 49, p. 337. [2] Servius ad Virg. *Æn.* III. 235.

[3] Niebuhr, *ubi supra.*

[4] That this *Sancus* was an Umbrian deity is clear from the Eugubine Tables. Indeed, both *sabus* and *sancus*, in the old languages of Italy, signified "sacred" or "revered," and were probably epithets regularly applied to the deity. In the Eugubine Tables we have the word *sev-um*, meaning "reverently" (I. *a.* 5); and *Sansius* is an epithet of the god *Fisus*, or *Fisovius* (VI. *b.* 3, 5). Comp. the Latin *sev-erus* (σέβ-ω) and *sanctus*. According to this, the name *Sabini* is nearly equivalent to *Sacrani*. The tables also mention the *picus Martius* of the Sabines, from which the *Piceni* derived their name (*piquier Martier*, V. *b.* 9, 14); comp. Strabo, V. p. 240.

[5] Niebuhr, I. note 430.

floods which had destroyed many an earlier race of men[1]. This is about as valuable as other Greek etymologies. The ethnographical import of the name will be examined in the following chapter, and we certainly do not need a forced etymology to prove that the Umbrians must have been among the earliest inhabitants of Italy. Cato said that their city Ameria was founded 381 years before Rome[2]. All that we read about them implies that they were a great and an ancient nation[3]. There are distinct traditions to prove that the country, afterwards called Etruria, was originally in the occupation of the Umbrians. The name of the primitive occupants of that country was preserved by the Tuscan river *Umbro*, and the tract of land through which it flowed into the sea was to the last called *Umbria*[4]. It is expressly stated that Cortona was once Umbrian[5]; and Camers, the ancient name of Clusium[6], points at once to the Camertes, a great Umbriam tribe[7]. It is certain also that the Umbrians occupied Picenum, till they were expelled from that region by their brethren the Sabines[8].

§ 8. *Reduced to insignificance by successive contacts with the Tyrrheno-Pelasgians and Etruscans.*

Since history, then, exhibits this once great nation expelled from the best part of its original possessions, driven beyond the Apennines, deprived of all natural barriers to the north, and reduced to insignificance, we are led at once to inquire into the cause of this phenomenon. Livy speaks of the Umbrians as dependent allies of the Tuscans[9]; and Strabo tells us that the Etruscans and Umbrians maintained a stubborn contest for the possession of the district between the Apennines and the mouth of the Po[10]. The people which thus ruled them or strove with them in the latter period of their history, when they were

---

1 See Plin. *H. N.* III. 19: "Umbrorum gens antiquissima Italiæ existimatur, ut quos *Ombrios* a Græcis putent dictos, quod inundatione terrarum imbribus superfuissent."

2 Pliny, III. 14, 19.

3 Florus, I. 17, Dionys. I. 19.

4 Pliny, III. 5. (8).

5 Dionys. I. 20.

6 Liv. X. 25.

7 Liv. IX. 36.

8 Pliny, III. 13, 14.

9 In Books IX. and X.

10 P. 216.

living within the circumscribed limits of their ultimate possessions, was that which deprived them of a national existence within the fairest portion of their originally wide domains.

It will be shown that the national integrity of the Umbrians was impaired by their successive contacts with the Tyrrheno-Pelasgians, and the Etruscans properly so called; and it will be convenient to consider, as separate questions, these qualifying elements in the population of ancient Umbria.

§ 9. *The* Pelasgians—*the differences of their position in Italy and Greece respectively.*

Without stopping to inquire at present who the Pelasgians were out of Italy, let us take them up where they first make their appearance at the mouth of the Po. We find that their area commences with this district, and that having crossed the Apennines, they wrested from the Umbrians the great city Camers, from whence they carried on war all around. Continually pressing towards the south, and as they advanced, conquering the indigenous tribes, or driving them up into the highlands, they eventually made themselves masters of all the level plains and of the coasts. Though afterwards, as we have seen, invaded in their turn, and in part conquered by the Oscan aborigines, they were for a long time in possession of Latium; and, under the widely diffused name of Œnotrians, they held all the south of Italy, till they were conquered or dispossessed by the spread of the great Sabellian race.

To these Pelasgians were due the most important elements in the ancient civilisation of Italy. It was not their destiny to be exposed throughout their settlements, like their brethren in Greece, to the overruling influence of ruder and more warlike tribes. This was to a certain extent the case in the south; where they were not only overborne by the power of their Sabellian conquerors, but also Hellenised by the Greek colonies which were at an early period established among them. But in Etruria and Latium the Pelasgian nationality was never extinguished: even among the Latins it survived the severest shocks of Oscan invasion. In Etruria it remained to the end the one prevailing characteristic of the people; and Rome herself, though she owed her military greatness to the Sabellian ingredient in her composition, was, to the days of her decline, Pelasgian in all the essentials of her language, her religion, and her law.

§ 10. *Preserve their national integrity in Etruria.*

It is easy to see why the Pelasgians retained their national integrity on the north-western coast so much more perfectly than in the south and east. It was because they entered Etruria in a body, and established there the bulk of their nation. All their other settlements were of the nature of colonies; and the density of the population, and its proportion to the number of the conquered mingled with it, varied, of course inversely, with the distance from the main body of the people. In Etruria the Pelasgians were most thickly settled, and next to Etruria in Latium. Consequently, while the Etruscans retained their conquest, and compelled the Sabines, the most vigorous of the dispossessed Umbrians, to direct their energies southwards, and while the Latins were only partially reconquered by the aboriginal tribes, the Pelasgians of the south resigned their national existence, and were merged in the concourse of Sabellian conquerors and Greek colonists.

§ 11. *Meaning and extent of the name* "TYRRHENIAN."

From the time of Herodotus[1] there has been no doubt that the Pelasgians in Greece and Italy were the same race, and that

---

[1] I. 57. The following is the substance of what Herodotus has told us respecting the Tyrrhenians and Pelasgians; and his information, though much compressed, is still very valuable. He seems tacitly to draw a distinction between the Pelasgians and the Tyrrhenians, whom he really identifies with one another. With regard to the latter he relates the Lydian story (I. 94: *φασὶ δὲ αὐτοὶ Λυδοί*), that Atys, son of Manes king of the Mæonians, had two sons, Lydus and Tyrrhenus. Lydus remained at home, and gave to the Mæonians the name of Lydians; whereas Tyrrhenus sailed to Umbria with a part of the population, and there founded the Tyrrhenian people. In general, Herodotus, when he speaks of the Tyrrhenians, is to be understood as referring to the Pelasgo-Etruscans. Of the Pelasgians he says (I. 56, sqq.), that they formed one of the original elements of the population of Greece, the division into Dorians and Ionians corresponding to the opposition of Hellenes to Pelasgians. In the course of his travels he had met with pure Pelasgians in Placie and Scylace on the Hellespont, and also in Creston; and their language differed so far from the Greek that he did not scruple to call it *barbarian* (c. 57). At the same time he seems to have been convinced that the Hellenes owed their greatness to their coalition with these barbarous Pelasgians (c. 58). The text of Herodotus

the so-called *Tyrrheni* or *Tyrseni* were the most civilised branch of that family. Herodotus, the great traveller of his time, was more entitled than any of his contemporaries to form a judgment on the subject, and he obviously identifies the Pelasgians with the Tyrrhenians on the coast of Asia Minor, in Greece, and in Italy. It is perhaps one of the many indications of the literary intercourse between Herodotus and Sophocles, which I have elsewhere established[1], that the latter, in a fragment of his *Inachus*, mentions the Tyrrheno-Pelasgians among the old inhabitants of Argos[2]. Lepsius[3] has fully shown that the name Τυρρηνὸς or

---

is undoubtedly corrupt in this passage; but the meaning is clear from the context. He says, that "the Hellenes having been separated from the Pelasgians, being weak and starting from small beginnings, have increased in population, principally in consequence of the accession of the Pelasgians and many other barbarous tribes." The reading *αὔξηται ἐς πλῆθος τῶν ἐθνέων πολλῶν* is manifestly wrong; not only because the position of the article is inadmissible, but also because *ἄλλων ἐθνέων βαρβάρων συχνῶν* immediately follows. I cannot doubt that we ought to read *αὔξηται ἐς πλῆθος, τῶν Πελασγῶν μάλιστα προσκεχωρηκότων αὐτῷ καὶ ἄλλων ἐθνέων βαρβάρων συχνῶν*. The epithet *πολλῶν* has crept into the text from a marginal explanation of *συχνῶν*, and *τῶν ἐθνέων πολλῶν* has consequently taken the place of the abbreviation *τῶν* ΠΛΓῶν [ΠΛΛῶν] for *τῶν Πελασγῶν*.

[1] *Proceed. of the Phil. Soc.* I. p. 161, sqq.

[2] Apud Dion. Hal. I. 25:

> Ἴναχε γεννᾶτορ παῖ κρηνῶν
> πατρὸς Ὠκεανοῦ, μέγα πρεσβεύων
> Ἄργους τε γύαις, Ἥρας τε πάγοις
> καὶ Τυρσηνοῖσι Πελασγοῖς.

See also *Schol. Apoll. Rh.* I. 580.

[3] *Ueber die Tyrrhenischen Pelasger in Etrurien.* Leipsig, 1842. Dr. Lepsius maintains the identity of the Tyrrheno-Pelasgians with the Etruscans; and in the former edition I accepted his view, which was true as far as it went: but subsequent research has convinced me that we must recognise a Rætian element superinduced on the previously existing combination of Tyrrheno-Pelasgian and Umbrian ingredients. We are indebted to this scholar for some of the most important contributions which Italian philology has ever received. In his treatise on the Eugubine Tables, which he published in the year 1833, as an exercise for his degree, he evinced an extent of knowledge, an accuracy of scholarship, and a maturity of judgment, such as we rarely meet with in so young a man. His collection of Umbrian and Oscan inscriptions (Lipsiæ, 1841) has supplied the greatest want felt by those who are interested in the old languages of Italy; and some fruitful results have proceeded from those

Τυρσηνὸς signifies "tower-builder," and that this term has been properly explained even by Dionysius[1], as referring to the τύρσεις or cyclopean fortifications which every where attest the presence of Pelasgian *tower-builders*. The word τύρρις or τύρσις, which occurs in Pindar as the name of the great palace of the primeval god Saturn[2], is identical with the Latin *turris*; and the fact, that the Pelasgians derived their distinguishing epithet from this word, is remarkable, not only as showing the affinity between the Greek and Latin languages on the one hand, and the Pelasgian in Etruria on the other hand, but also because these colossal structures are always found wherever the Pelasgians make their appearance in Greece. Fortresses in Pelasgian countries received their designation as often from these τύρσεις as from the name *Larissa*, which seems to signify the abode of the *lars* or *prince*. Thus the old Pelasgian Argos had two citadels or ἀκροπόλεις, the one called the *Larissa*, the other τὸ ἄργος, *i. e.* the *arx*[3]. In the neighbourhood, however, was the city *Tiryns*, which is still remarkable for its gigantic cyclopean remains, and in the name of which we may recognise the word τύρρις[4]; not much farther on the other side was *Thy-*

---

inquiries into the Egyptian language and history in which he has long been engaged. Unless I am misinformed, Dr. Lepsius has to thank the Chevalier Bunsen for the advantages which he has enjoyed in Italy, in France, and in Egypt.

[1] I. 26: ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρυμάτων, ἃ πρῶτοι τῶν τῇδε οἰκούντων κατεσκευάσαντο. τύρσεις γὰρ καὶ παρὰ Τυῤῥηνοῖς αἱ ἐντείχιοι καὶ στεγαναὶ οἰκήσεις ὀνομάζονται, ὥσπερ παρ' Ἕλλησιν. Tzetzes, *ad Lycophr.* 717: τύρσις τὸ τεῖχος, ὅτι Τυρσηνοὶ πρῶτον ἔφευρον τὴν τειχοποιΐαν. Comp. *Etym. M.* s. v. τύραννος.

[2] *Ol.* II. 70: ἔτειλαν Διὸς ὁδὸν παρὰ Κρόνου τύρσιν. See also Orph. *Argon.* 151: τύρσιν ἐρυμνῆς Μιλήτοιο. Suidas: τύρσος, τὸ ἐν ὕψει ᾠκοδομημένον. The word τύραννος contains the same root: comp. κοίρανος with κάρα, and the other analogies pointed out in the *New Cratylus*, § 336.

[3] Liv. XXXIV. 25 "Utrasque *arces*, nam *duas* habent *Argi*."

[4] According to Theophrastus (*apud Plin.* VII. 57), the inhabitants of Tiryns were the inventors of the τύρσεις. As early as Homer's time the town was called τειχιόεσσα (*Il.* II. 559), and its walls are described by Euripides (*Electr.* 1158. *Iph. in Aul.* 152, 1501. *Troad.* 1088) as κυκλώπεια οὐράνια τείχη. The mythological personage *Tiryns* is called "the son of Argos" (Paus. II. 25), who, according to Steph. Byz., derived his origin from *Pelasgus*, who civilized Arcadia (Pausan. VIII. 1),

rea, which Pausanias connects with the fortified city *Thyræon*[1], in the middle of Pelasgian Arcadia; and more to the south we have the Messenian *Thuria*, and *Thyrides* at the foot of Tænaron. Then again, in the northern abodes of the Pelasgians, we find *Tyrrheum*, a fortified place not far from the Pelasgian Dodona, and also a *Tirida* in Thrace[2]. At no great distance from the Thessalian *Larissa* and *Argissa* lay the Macedonian *Tyrissa*, a name which reminds us of the Spanish *Turissa in agro Tarraconensi*[3]; and the *Tyrrhenica Tarraco*, with its massive walls[4], fully establishes the connexion of this latter place with the Tyrrhenians[5].

§ 12. The Etruscans—*the author's theory respecting their origin.*

The fact that the distinctive name Τυῤῥηνὸς admits of a Greek interpretation is sufficient to show that the Tyrrhenians were not exclusively Italian, and therefore were wrongly identified by the ancient writers with the singular and unaffiliated nation of the Etruscans. To determine the origin of this people and the nature of their language has been considered for many years as the most difficult problem in Philology. And while

---

and was the father of Larissa (Id. VII. 17), and grandfather of Thessalus (Dionys. I. 17).

[1] It was built by *Thyræus* the grandson of Pelasgus (Paus. VIII. 35).

[2] Plin. *N. H.* IV. 18: "Oppidum quondam Diomedis equorum stabulis dirum."

[3] Anton. *Itin.*

[4] Müller, *Etrusker*, I. p. 291. Auson. *Ep.* 24, 88.

[5] Lepsius suggests also, that the *Turres* on the coast near Cære and Alsium may have been a Roman translation of the name Τύῤῥεις. With regard to the city of *Tyrrha* in Lydia, and the district of *Torrhebia*, to which the Tyrrhenians referred their origin, it is worthy of remark that the civilized *Toltecs*, who introduced architecture, agriculture, and the useful arts into Mexico, and whose capital was *Tula*, bore a name which passed into a synonym for *architect*. See Prescott, *Conquest of Mexico*, I. p. 12; Sahagun, *Hist. de nueva España*, lib. X. c. 29; Torquemado, *Monarch. Ind.* lib. I. c. 14. The Toltecs were in general very like the Tyrrhenians, and the Etruscans, by their gorgeous luxury and their skill in cookery, &c., remind one very much of the united race of Aztecs and Toltecs which Cortes found in Mexico.

Bonarota, in his supplement to Dempster[1], earnestly exhorts the learned, and especially orientalists, to labour at the discovery of this lost language, suggesting the hope of ultimate success, if a carefully edited collection of inscriptions can be procured to furnish materials for the work, Niebuhr remarks, in his lectures on Ancient Geography[2]: "People feel an extraordinary curiosity to discover the Etruscan language; and who would not entertain this sentiment? I would give a considerable part of my worldly means as a prize, if it were discovered; for an entirely new light would then be spread over the ethnography of ancient Italy. But however desirable it may be, it does not follow that the thing is attainable." And he proceeds to point out the inherent faultiness of some previous investigations. Whatever may be the value of the discovery, I cannot allow myself to doubt that the true theory is that which I have had the honour of submitting to the British Association[3]. It has always appeared to me a very great reproach to modern philology that while we can read the hieroglyphic literature of Egypt, and interpret the cuneiform inscriptions of Persia and Assyria, we should profess ourselves unable to deal scientifically with the remains of a language which flourished in the midst of Roman civilization. So far from regarding the problem as involved in hopeless difficulty, I have always felt that its solution was, sooner or later, inevitable; and as the present state of our ethnographic knowledge enables us to classify and discriminate all the different elements in the population of Europe, the identification of the ancient Etruscans must reduce itself to the alternative of exclusion, from which there is no escape. Sir Thomas More came to the conviction that his unknown visitor

---

[1] p. 106: "hortari postremo fas mihi sit, doctos præcipue linguis Orientalibus viros, ut animi vires intendant, ad illustrandam veterem Etruscam linguam, tot jam seculis deperditam. Et quis vetat sperare, quod temporum decursu emergat aliquis, qui difficilem et inaccessam viam aperiat: et penetralia linguæ hujus reseret; si præcipue cives et incolæ urbium et locorum ubi inscriptiones Etruscæ reperiuntur sedulo et diligenter excipi et delineari curent monumenta, &c."

[2] *Vorträge über alte Länder—und Völkerkunde.* Berl. 1851. p. 531.

[3] "On two unsolved problems in Indo-German Philology," in the *Report of the Brit. Assoc. for the Advancement of Science for* 1851, pp. 138—159.

was *aut Erasmus, aut Diabolus*, and we may now say in the same manner, that unless the Etruscans were old Low Germans of the purest Gothic stock, there is no family of men to whom they could have belonged. The demonstration of this, however, belongs to a later part of the subject. At present we have only to consider the Etruscans as they appear in the peninsula of Italy.

§ 13. *The names* Etruscus *and* Rasena *cannot be brought to an agreement with* Tyrsenus.

We have already seen that the *Tyrseni* or *Tyrrheni* in Greece and Italy were a branch of the great Pelasgian race, and that although the ancients considered them identical with the Etruscans, the Greek explanation of which their name so readily admits is a proof that they could not have been the exclusively Italian tribe of the Etruscans. Modern scholars, who have adopted the ancient hypothesis of the identity of the *Tyrrheni* and *Etrusci*, have endeavoured by a Procrustean method of etymology to overcome the difficulties caused by the discrepancies of name. Thus the distinctive designation *Etruscus* or *Hetruscus* is clipt and transposed until it becomes identical with the Latin *Tuscus* for *Tursicus*, and synonymous with the Greek Τυρσήνος[1]. On the other hand, the Ῥασένα of Dionysius is pronounced a false reading and a mutilated representative of Ταρασένα or Ταρσένα, which bears the same relation to Τυρσηνὸς that *Porsĕna* does to Πορσηνός or Πορσήνας[2]. There is an allurring facility about this emendation, but it is a shock to the most credulous etymologist, when we prefix a syllable to one word and decapitate another in order to bring them both to an agreement with a third designation. In philology, as in other departments of human science, we perceive resemblances before we can be persuaded that they are connected with irreconcilable discrepancies. This we may see in the identification of the word Τυῤῥηνὸς with another name peculiar to the Etruscans of

---

[1] Müller, *Etrusk.* I. 71, 72.

[2] This view has been successively adopted by Lanzi (*Saggio*, I. p. 189); Gell (*Rome and its vicinity*, I. p. 364, 5); Cramer (*Ancient Italy*, I. p. 161); and Lepsius (u. s. p. 23); and formerly approved itself to my judgment.

Italy, which appears under the form Ταρχώνιον; *Tarkynia, Tarquinii.* It is perfectly consistent with sound philology to say that Τυρσ- may be a softer form of Ταρχ-, *Tark-*, or *Tarq-*. But, as I have elsewhere shown, if ταρχ- or τραχ- and τυρσ- belonged to the same root, the latter must be a secondary or assibilated form of the other. Now to say nothing of the fact that the σ- of τυρ-σηνός and τύρ-σις belongs to the termination, and is not found in τύρ-αννος, Τίρ-υνς, Θυρ-έα, Θύρ-αιον, &c., it is clear that the form Τυρ-σηνὸς is the only one which was ever known to the Pelasgians in Greece, while the harder form belongs to the later or mixed race in Italy. They must therefore be considered as different words. There is no reason why the names *Et-rūria* = *Et-rusia* (cf. *Apŭlus, Apūlia*), *Et-rus-ci*, and *Ras-ena* should not contain the same root: and we shall see that there are good grounds for retaining these words as the primitive and distinctive designation of a people who invaded and conquered the mixed Tyrrhenians and Umbrians of northern Italy.

§ 14. *It is explicitly stated by ancient writers that the Etruscans came from Rœtia.*

Livy, who, as a native of Padua, was likely to be well-informed on the subject, has left us a statement respecting the Etruscans, which, so far from being hypothetical, is one of the most definite expressions of ethnological facts to be met with in ancient history. Speaking of the Gallic invasion and the attack upon Clusium, he says (V. 33): "nor were the people of Clusium the first of the Etruscans with whom armies of the Gauls fought; but long before this they frequently fought with the Etruscans who dwelt between the Apennines and the Alps. Before the Roman empire was established the power of the Etruscans extended far by land and sea. This is shown by the names of the upper and lower seas by which Italy is girt like an island: for while the Italian nations have called the former the Tuscan sea by the general appellation of the people, they have designated the latter the Hadriatic, from Hadria a colony of the Tuscans. The Greeks call these same seas the Tyrrhenian and the Hadriatic. This people inhabited the country extending to both seas in confederacies of twelve cities each, first, twelve cities on this side of the Apennines towards the lower sea,

afterwards, having sent across the Apennines as many colonies as there were capital cities in the mother-country; and these occupied the whole territory beyond the Po, as far as the Alps[1], except the corner of the Veneti, who dwell round the extreme point of the Hadriatic. There is no doubt that the Alpine nations, especially the Ræti, have the same origin, but these have lost their civilization from their climate and locality, so as to retain nothing of their original type except their spoken language, and not even that without corruption." This distinct and positive statement is repeated by Pliny (*H. N.* V. 20, 133) and Justin (XX. 5), and is confirmed by relics of art, names of places, and peculiarities of language in the Tyrol, to which the Rætians of Lombardy were driven by the Gauls, and from which they descended in the first instance. Moreover, Stephanus of Byzantium defines the *Ræti* as a Tyrrhenian, that is, in his sense, as an Etruscan race (Ῥαιτοί, Τυρρηνικὸν ἔθνος), and it is quite in accordance with the laws of language to suppose that Ῥαιτοί and Ῥασένα are only modifications of the same word[2]. It is scarcely necessary to remark that Livy, like all the ancient writers, inverts the relation between the powerful colonists and their uncivilized mother-country.

§ 15. *This view of the case is after all the most reasonable.*

Now if we are to adopt the old statement that the Etruscans, properly so called, were the same stock with the Rætians—and if we reject it there is nothing in ancient history or geography which we can with confidence accept[3]—there will be no difficulty in understanding the relation between the Etruscans and the other Italian tribes. Long after the Tyrrheno-Pelasgians had established their civilisation on both sides of the Tiber, and had conquered the Umbrian mountaineers in the north, but yielded to the Oscan or Sabine highlanders in the south, long after this time a Rætian tribe sallied forth from the plains of Lombardy, where

---

[1] Among other places Mantua is expressly mentioned as a Tuscan city; Virgil, *Æn.* X. 198—200.

[2] Compare, for example, the cognate German words *reiten* and *reisen*.

[3] Abeken says (*Mittel-Italien*, p. 21): "diese Meinung, von Niebuhr zuerst entschieden ausgesprochen, wird auch die herrschende bleiben." This view was first maintained by Freret (*Acad. d. Inscr.* t. XVIII).

it was settled in unbroken connexion with sister tribes in the Tyrol and south-western Germany, and not only effected a permanent conquest of Umbria, but also settled itself as a military aristocracy among the civilized Tyrrhenians on the right of the Tiber. These conquerors included in their progress the Tyrrheno-Latin city, Rome, which had just shaken off the influence of the Tarquinii, but they lost this and their other acquisitions beyond the Tiber, in consequence of a defeat which the dominant Clusians sustained at Aricia. In every feature of this Etruscan invasion we may observe an analogy to the similar proceedings of the Gallic tribes, who at a still later period descended into Lombardy from the west. They succeeded in breaking through the continuity of the Rætian settlement by establishing themselves in the territory afterwards called Cisalpine Gaul. They also invaded Umbria and Etruria, besieged the imperial city of Clusium, and even sacked Rome. But they were borne back again, not without a severe struggle, to the region from which the Etruscans started, and the city of the Seven Hills was to each of these northern invaders the limit of their progress to the south.

§ 16. *It is confirmed by all available evidence, and especially by the contrast between the town and country languages of ancient Etruria.*

This view with respect to the Rætian invasion of a country previously occupied by Tyrrheno-Umbrians is fully supported by all the remains of their language, and by all that we know about this idiom. The details of this subject belong to a future chapter. It is sufficient to mention in this place that the Etruscan language, as exhibited in the fragments which have come down to us, consists of three separate or separable elements. We have either words which admit of a direct comparison with Greek and Latin, and these we will call the Tyrrheno-Pelasgian element of the language; or words which present affinities to the Umbrian and Oscan dialects; or words which resemble neither of the other, but may be explained by the Gothic affinities, which, for other reasons, we should be led to seek in the language of the Rætians. The first element appears most in the words quoted with an explanation by Roman writers, that is, in words of the southern Etruscans, who were to the last the purest representa-

tives of the Tyrrheno-Pelasgians. We find the same kind of words in inscriptions from the same district. On the other hand, in the great cities of northern Etruria, and especially in the highlands of Umbria, we either find a mixed idiom, or must seek our explanations from the Gothic idioms to which I have referred. If the Etruscans, properly so called, did not establish themselves permanently or in very great numbers much to the south of Volsinii, and if in all their conquests to the south-west of their territory they rather occupied the cities than peopled the fields,—and both these appear on the face of their history,—it will follow that the περίοικοι in South Etruria, as in Laconia after the Dorian invasion, and in England after the Norman conquest, would retain their original, that is, their Tyrrheno-Pelasgian dialect. This fact is illustrated by two incidents to which Lepsius has referred with a somewhat different object[1]. Livy tells us (X. 4,) that in the year 301 B.C. the legate Cn. Fulvius, serving in Etruria, escaped an ambush and detected some pretended shepherds who would have led him into it, by learning from the men of Cære who acted as his interpreters, that the shepherds spoke the town language, not that of the country, and that their outward appearance did not correspond to that of rustics. The same author informs us (IX. 36,) that in the year 308 B.C. a Roman nobleman and his slave, who had learned Etruscan at Cære, travelled through the Ciminian forest and as far as the Camertes who lived around Clusium, and that they escaped detection on this journey which carried them through the whole extent of southern Etruria. From these two incidents we infer that the town dialects of the Etruscans differed more or less from those of the country people, and that the country dialect about Cære, which must have been Tyrrheno-Pelasgian, was intelligible to the country people as far north as Clusium. This is quite in accordance with the parallel cases of the Saxons as subjected to the Normans, and the Achæans as reduced to vassalage by the Dorians; and the *agrestes Etruscorum cohortes* mentioned by Livy (IX. 36,) and the bands of πενέσται or feudal retainers, whom the Etruscan nobles (οἱ δυνατώτατοι) took with them to battle, (Dionysius, IX. 5,) indicate the same distinction which is always observable in an aristocracy of conquest.

---

[1] U. s. p. 32.

§ 17. *Further inferences derivable from (a) the traditionary history of the* Luceres.

To return to the Seven Hills of Rome, we shall find, as was stated at the beginning of this investigation, that the relations in which the inhabitants of the city stood to one another are the same, on a smaller scale, with those which connected or distinguished the inhabitants of the whole peninsula of Italy. And here scientific etymology throws a wonderful light on the apparently discordant facts preserved by an undiscriminating tradition.

It appears that the Oscan or Alban Ramnes on the Palatine[1] had reduced the Pelasgians on the Cælian to a state of dependence or vassalage; what took place in Latium generally was also enacted on the Septimontium. These two communities—one of which we may call Roma, and the other Lucerum—constituted the original city of Rome, which contended on a footing of equality with the Quirites: hence the legend calls *Roma* the daughter of Italus and Leucaria[2],—of the aboriginal Oscans, and the foreign or Pelasgian Luceres. When Roma admitted Quirium to the privileges of citizenship, the Quirites naturally took rank above the subject Luceres, and the *celsi Ramnes* still remained at the head of the *populus*. According to one story, they compelled the Luceres to leave their stronghold and descend to the plain[3]. It appears, too, that, together with the Cælian town, the Palatine Romans ruled over the possessions of the Luceres in the Solonian plain, which were called the *Pectuscum Palati*, or "breast-work of the Palatine[4]." Now, it is distinctly said, that the Luceres were first raised to the full privileges of the other burgesses by the first Tarquinius, who both introduced them into the senate, and also gave

---

[1] The "Palatini aborigines ex agro Reatino," as Varro calls them (*L. L.* V. § 53).

[2] Plutarch. *Romul.* II., where we must read Λευκαρίας.

[3] Varro, *L. L.* V. § 46.

[4] Festus, p. 213, Müller: "Pectuscum Palati dicta est ea regio Urbis, quam Romulus obversam posuit, ea parte in qua plurimum erat agri Romani ad mare versus et qua mollissime adibatur urbs, cum Etruscorum agrum a Romano Tiberis discluderet, ceteræ vicinæ civitates colles aliquos haberent oppositos."

them representatives among the ministers of religion[1]. And who was this *Lucius Tarquinius* but a *Lucumo* or grandee from the Tuscan city *Tarquinii*, who settled at Rome, and was raised to the throne? Indeed, there seems to be but little reason to doubt that he was the Cæles Vivenna[2], whose friend and successor Mastarna appears under the name of Servius Tullius[3]. The difference in the policy of the first and second of these Tuscan kings of Rome need not surprise us. Every scattered hint referring to this Tullius, or Mastarna, represents him as connected with that Pelasgian branch of the Roman population which eventually furnished the greater part of the *plebs*[4]; whereas Vivenna, or Tarquinius, was a patrician or *Lucumo* of the Tuscan city Tarquinii, and his prejudices were of course aristocratic, or rather, as was more fully developed in the case of the second Tarquinius, tyrannical; for only the absolute sovereign of a great nation could have accomplished the wonderful works which were achieved by this Tarquinian Lucumo. There is sufficient reason to believe that Rome stood high as a Tuscan town during the last years of its monarchal history. The Septimontium, if not the capital of southern Etruria[5], was at least the southern bulwark of the twelve cities, and extended its dominion over a large part of the Sabine territory. The fall of the regal power of Rome has been well ascribed to the decline of Tarquinii and the rising predominance of Clusium. If Lars Porsena, when he conquered Rome, had really been anxious for the restoration of Superbus, he might easily have replaced him on the throne; but he was so far from doing this, that he did not even grant him an *exsilium* in his own dominions. The

---

[1] See Niebuhr, I. p. 296; III. p. 350.

[2] Niebuhr, I. p. 375, note 922; and *Kleine Schriften*, II. p. 26, sqq.

[3] See the celebrated Lugdunensian Table, Lipsius, *Excurs. ad Tac. Ann.* XI. 24. Müller (*Etrusker*, I. 118—123) ingeniously conjectures that the reigns of the Tarquins mythically represent the predominance of the city Tarquinii, which was for a time interfered with by Mastarna, the representative of the rival city Volsinii. Tarquinii, however, for a while resumed her influence; but at last was obliged to succumb, like the other Tuscan cities, to Clusium.

[4] See, for instance, Livy, I. 30, where both Tullius and Servilius (Niebuhr, I. note 920) are mentioned as Latin family names.

[5] Niebuhr, I. p. 373.

vanquished Lucumo of Rome took refuge, not at Clusium, but at Cumæ[1], with Porsena's great enemy Aristodemus[2], whom he made his heir, and who subsequently defeated and slew Aruns Porsena, when, with a Clusian army, he made war on Aricia, and endeavoured to found a Tuscan empire in Latium.

§ 18. (*b*) *Fragmentary records of the early Constitution of Rome.*

The inferences derivable from these traditions are materially confirmed by some fragmentary records of the constitutional history of early Rome. The revolutionary movement, by which the second Tarquinius was expelled, is always connected with the influence and agency of Junius Brutus, who then held the office of *Tribunus Celerum*. The result of this revolution was to substitute two *consules* or colleagues for the old kingly government. But whenever it was thought advisable, on great emergencies, to revert to the authority of a single chief, we find that this *Dictator*, as he was called, appeared as a *Magister Populi*, or head of the old patrician tribes, and that he was invariably associated with a *Magister Equitum*, or head of the plebeian knights, whom the elder Tarquin admitted to the full franchise, and so made his senate to consist of *Patres*, or original deputies, and *Conscripti*, or additional counsellors. The *Duumviri Perduellionis* and other ancient dualisms pointed out by Niebuhr are additional indications of a two-fold division of the Roman people long before the growth of the later *plebs*. Now if the second order corresponded to the *Luceres*, as opposed to the combined populus of *Ramnes* and *Tities*, we can easily see that the Tarquinian influence, as exercised by Cæles Vivenna and Mastarna, was favourable not only to the *Celeres* or richer class among the

---

[1] Cramer's *Italy*, II. p. 150.

[2] There are many traces of the connexion of the Roman Tuscans with the Greeks. The first Tarquin himself is represented as half a Greek; and Macaulay has pointed out very clearly the Greek features of the second Tarquinian legend (*Lays of Ancient Rome*, p. 80). The equestrian games of the Tarquins, and their reverence for the Delphic oracle, also imply frequent intercourse with Greece, of which we read still more distinctly in the case of Pyrgi, the renowned port of Agylla, or Cære, another Etruscan town, which, like Tarquinii, was intimately connected with Rome.

Luceres, but also to the Proletarians, and generally to the whole population; whereas the second Tarquinius is indicated by his whole history as having endeavoured to reduce and degrade the inferior order of his subjects, until some final outrage roused the whole city to vengeance, the *Luceres* however taking the lead under the guidance of their legitimate leader the *Tribunus Celerum*. The result of this revolution was to reduce the *populus*, or two elder tribes, to a footing of tolerable equality with the *Luceres;* and the lays or legends represent the latter as having purchased their position by a pre-eminence of sufferings and of services, both in the expulsion of the Tarquinian dynasty and in the subsequent resistance to the foreign domination of the Clusians.

§ 19. (*c*) *Etymology of some mythical proper names.*

A great deal of new light may be derived from a careful examination of the proper names *Horatius* and *Lucretius*, the former representing the inferior position of the populace, the latter the local designation of the *Luceres*. The word *Hor-atius* is derived from the old Latin word *hir*, "a hand," and is therefore a longer form of *Hir-tius*, just as *Curiatius* is of *Cur-tius*. The fight between the *Horatii* and *Curiatii* probably refers to a contest between the *Cūriātii* (κούρητες), "men of the *curia*, and wielders of the spear, or wearers of the helmet," and the *Hŏrātii* (χερνῆτες), "handicraftsmen," *i. e.* the lower order, in which contest, as usual, the latter succeeded in maintaining their just rights. In the old tradition it is uncertain which of the two fought for Alba (Liv. I. 24), *i. e.* whether the Latin or Sabine interest was at that time predominant at Rome. The story about Horatius Cocles admits of a similar interpretation. The Tuscans were repelled at the bridge-head by the three Roman tribes—*Lartius* (*Larth, Lars*, "prince" or "king") representing the head-tribe, *Herminius* the second, and *Horatius* the third. The surname *Cocles* still farther explains the name *Horatius* in its opposition to *Curiatius*. The ancients knew that this word meant one-eyed (Plin. *H. N.* XXXVII. 55), and I have elsewhere suggested that it may be derived from *cæculus* (*N. Crat.* § 154). The last part is undoubtedly that derivative from *i-re*, which is found in *mil-it-es, ped-it-es, equ-it-es*, &c. With the Romans, as with other nations, the ideas of *being* and

going are interchangeable (*N. Crat.* § 269), and therefore we should not press the meaning of this termination farther than by saying that *cocles* is a form analogous to *miles*, &c. Now the other term for one-eyed is *luscus*, which is to be compared with λοξός, λοξίας. This last word, as the name of the archer-god, *Apollo*, refers unquestionably to the oblique or side-long position of the bowman in the act of shooting; and there is no reason why the same explanation should not apply to the *cocl-it-es*, who will thus represent the ψιλοὶ or light-armed troops of the commonalty. As in the case of David and Goliath, the triumph is greater when there is an inequality in the arms; and this no doubt was felt to enhance the Horatian victory and the successful defence of the *Pons Sublicius*. Considered as an army, the Romans fell into the following subdivisions—the *populus* or patrician ὁπλῖται, the *celeres* or plebeian knights, and the *plebs*, i. e. πλῆθος, or *multitudo*, who were the *milites*, properly so called, "the common soldiers who marched in a body," and who were by virtue of their armour merely *coclites*, or "shooters." And thus the *magister populi* and *magister equitum*, or *tribunus celerum*, will stand in a military opposition to the *tribuni plebis*. The separation between the *populus* and *plebs*, which is most strongly indicated by the refusal of the *connubium*, or right of intermarriage, to the latter, renders it possible that the patricians were called *proceres*, "wooers," or *proci patricii*, "patrician suiters" (Festus, p. 249, Müller), with particular reference to this crowning mark of political equality. And a comparison of *proceres* with *celeres* might lead us to infer, that, while the original *patres* were termed *proci*, the *celeres* or *conscripti* were designated as *proceres*, the termination indicating the later acquisition of the *connubium*. The meaning of the name *Herminius* is not obvious at first sight; it does not sound like a Latin name. When however we call to mind that the most ancient name for a noble warrior in Greek was ἥρως, which may be proved to be equal to ἠρ-Fαοτ-ς = ἠρ-φωτ-ς, "the lord-warrior" (*N. Crat.* § 329), and when we recollect that *herus* is a good Latin word, and that *min* is found in *ho-min-*, *ne-min-*, &c., we may well suppose that *Her-minius* represents a form analogous to ἥρως, and therefore that, as *Lartius* typifies the nobles, and *Horatius* the common people, so *Herminius* personifies the warriors of Rome. And this explanation of the name is quite in accordance with the meaning of the word *Hermann* or

Hirmin (the *Arminius* of Tacitus) in those Low-German languages with which the Sabine and other Italian idioms were so intimately connected. Grimm says (*Deutsche Mythol.* p. 328, 2d edit.): "die Sachsen scheinen in *Hirmin* einen *kriegerisch dargestellten Wôdan* verehrt zu haben." We find a further confirmation in the fact, that his name was *Titus Herminius;* for not only does *Titus* signify "warrior" (Fest. p. 366, Müller: "*Tituli* milites appellantur quasi *tutuli,* quod patriam tuerentur, unde et *Titi* prænomen ortum est"), but the *Titienses,* or *Tities,* were actually "the Sabine *quirites* (spearmen)," the *second* tribe at Rome. By a similar personification, the senior consul, Valerius, who as *poplicola* represents the *populus,* has under his orders *Titus Herminius,* the "warriors," and *Spurius Lartius* the "young nobles[1];" while the other consul, *Lucretius,* represents the *Luceres,* or third class of citizens (Liv. II. 11). Even Lucretia may be nothing more than a symbol of the third order of the *populus;* so that her ill-treatment by Sextus will be an allegory referring to the oppression of the Luceres, who often approximated to the *plebs,* by the tyrannical Etruscan dynasty. It is also singular that *Lucretius* and *Horatius,* both representatives of the third class, succeed one another in the first consulship. The prænomen of *Spurius Lartius* does not appear to be the Latin *spurius,* "illegitimate," but a Tuscan derivative from *super,* the first vowel being omitted, according to the Tuscan custom, and the second softened into *u,* as in *augur* (also perhaps a Tuscan word) for *aviger.* That *Spurius* was a Tuscan name appears from the derivative *Spurinna.*

If, as seems probable, *Cœles* is only a modification of *Cœres,* the name of *Cœles Vivenna* will indicate him as one of the *Cœrites,* that is as belonging to the most purely Pelasgian part of South Etruria. And then we have an additional confirmation of our belief that the Tarquinian dynasty was in the first instance at least Pelasgo-Tyrrhenian, rather than *Rasenic* or Rætian.

§ 20. *General Conclusion as to the mutual Relations of the old Italian Tribes.*

These traditionary facts and philological deductions enable us to come to a fixed conclusion on the subject of the old population

---

[1] At a later period these two are combined in the one designation *Lars Herminius* (Liv. III. 65).

of Italy, and the relations of the different tribes to one another. How they stood related to the Transpadane members of the great European family is a subsequent inquiry; but within the limits of Italy proper, we may now say, there were originally two branches of one great family,—the Umbrians, extending from the Po to the Tiber; and the Oscans, occupying the southern half of the peninsula. These nations were combined, in different degrees, with Pelasgians from the north-east. The main body of these Pelasgians assumed a distinct nationality in Etruria, and established a permanent empire there, which the Umbrians could never throw off. Another great horde of Pelasgians was settled in Latium, where they were afterwards partially conquered by the Oscans; and a mixed population of Pelasgians and Oscans extended to the very south of Italy. The Sabines, however, who were members of the Umbrian family, returned from the hills, to which the Pelasgians had driven them, and pressed upon the other Umbrians, upon the Oscans, and upon those Latins who were a mixture of conquered Pelasgians and Oscan conquerors. The combination of a branch of these Sabines with a branch of the Latins settled on the Tiber constituted the first beginnings of that Roman people which, standing in the midst of these Pelasgian and Oscan races, eventually became a point of centralisation for them all. Not to speak of any Celtic substratum, which we have many reasons for assuming, we may feel assured that up to the commencement of history the population of ancient Italy consisted entirely of this admixture or juxta-position of Umbro-Oscan and Tyrrheno-Pelasgian tribes. But about the time when the ancient annalists begin to speak definitely, the south of the peninsula became studded with Greek colonies, and the north was conquered by a Rætian tribe, the Rasena or Etruscans properly so called; and while the Greeks never spread themselves in the northern provinces, the surging tide of the Etruscan invasion was beaten back from the walls of Rome; and the Gauls, who at a later period endeavoured to extend their settlements to the south of the Tiber, were obliged to content themselves with the still remoter districts beyond the Rubicon.

CHAPTER II.

THE FOREIGN AFFINITIES OF THE ANCIENT ITALIANS.

§ 1. Etymology of the word Πελασγός. § 2. How the Pelasgians came into Europe. § 3. Inferences derivable from the contrast of Pelasgian and Hellenic architecture. § 4. Supported by deductions from the contrasted mythology of the two races. § 5. Thracians, Getæ, and Scythians. § 6. Scythians and Medes. § 7. Iranian origin of the Sarmatians, Scythians, and Getæ, may be shown (1) generally, and (2) by an examination of the remains of the Scythian language. § 8. Mode of discriminating the ethnical elements in this chain of nations. § 9. Peculiarities of the Scythian language suggested by Aristophanes. § 10. Names of the Scythian rivers derived and explained. § 11. Names of the Scythian divinities. § 12. Other Scythian words explained. § 13. Successive peopling of Asia and Europe: fate of the Mongolian race. § 14. The Pelasgians were of Sclavonian origin. § 15. Foreign affinities of the Umbrians, &c. § 16. Reasons for believing that they were the same race as the Lithuanians. § 17. Further confirmation from etymology. § 18. Celtic tribes intermixed with the Sclavonians and Lithuanians in Italy and elsewhere. § 19. The Sarmatæ probably a branch of the Lithuanian family. § 20. Gothic or Low-German affinities of the ancient Etruscans shown by their ethnographic opposition to the Veneti. § 21. Reasons for comparing the old Etruscan with the old Norse. § 22. Old Norse explanations of Etruscan proper names. § 23. Contacts and contrasts of the Semitic and the Sclavonian. § 24. Predominant Sclavonism of the old Italian languages.

§ 1. *Etymology of the word* Πελασγός.

SINCE the Umbrians, Oscans, &c. must be regarded in the first instance as the aboriginal inhabitants, the inquirer, who would pass the limits of Italy and investigate the foreign affinities of the Italians, is first attracted by the Pelasgians. The seats of this race in Greece and elsewhere are well known; but there is no satisfactory record as to the region from which they started on their wide-spread migrations, or the countries which they traversed on their route. According to some they were Cretans, others make them Philistines, others again Egyptians; in fact, there is hardly one ancient nation which has not been indicated in its turn as their parent stock. Even their name has received almost every possible etymology. The older scholars derived the word Πελασγός from Peleg[1]; Sturz connects it with πελάζω[2];

---

[1] Salmasius *de Hellenistica*, p. 342. [2] *De Dialect. Macedon.* p. 9.

Hermann finds the root in πέλαγος, from πελάζω[1]; Wachsmuth[2] and Müller[3], considering πελαργός to be the original form of the word, give as its etymology πέλω, "to till," and ἄγρος, "the field," looking upon the nation as originally devoted to husbandry. The most common derivation is that which writes Πελαργοί, and interprets it "the storks," either from the wandering habits of this race[4], or from their linen dress[5], or from their barbarous speech[6]. Every one of these etymologies admits of an easy confutation. The best answer to them all is to point out a better analysis of the word. Buttmann[7] suggested long ago that the last two syllables were an ethnical designation, connected with the name *Asca-nius*, common in Phrygia, Lydia, and Bithynia, and with the name of Asia itself. He also correctly pointed to the relationship between *Ashkenaz*, the son of Gomer, and *Javan*, the biblical progenitor of the Ionians (Ἰάϝονες) (*Gen.* x. 3). Now the first syllable of the word *Pelasgus* is clearly the same as that of *Pel-ops*. There are two Niobes in Greek mythology, daughters, the one of Phoroneus, the other of Tantalus—the latter is the sister of *Pelops*, the former the mother of *Pelasgus*. The syllable Πελ- stands in the same relation to μελ- that πέδα does to μετά. The original form of the root signifying "blackness" was κμελ-[8]; but the labial generally predominated over the guttural element. Of the labial forms, that with the tenuis more usually came to signify "livid" than "black;" as we see in the words πέλιος, πελιδνός, &c. Apollodorus expressly says[9] that Πελιάς was so called because his face was rendered livid (πέλιος) by a kick from a horse; and it is obvious that Πέλ-οψ, which signifies "dark-

---

[1] *Opusc.* II. p. 174: "πέλαγος enim, a verbo πελάζειν dictum, ut ab Latinis *Venilia*, mare notat: a qua origine etiam πελασγοί, *advenæ*."

[2] *Hellenische Alterthumsk.* I. p. 29, Trans. p. 39. He also, half in jest, refers to πλάζειν, "to lead astray," p. 36.

[3] "Von πέλω (πόλις, πολέω, der Sparte Πελώρ, und Πελώρια, das Fest der *Bewohnung*) und ἄργος." *Orchom.* p. 125.

[4] Strabo, V. p. 221; VIII. p. 397.

[5] Bekker, *Anecd.* p. 229: διὰ τὰς σινδόνας ἃς ἐφόρουν. So also *Etymol. Magn.*

[6] *Philol. Mus.* I. p. 615.

[7] *Lexilogus*, I. p. 68, note 1.

[8] *New Cratylus*, § 121. Buttmann's *Lexil.* II. p. 265.

[9] I. 9, § 8.

faced" or "swarthy," is an ethnical designation which differs from the well-known name *Αἰθίοψ* only in the degree of blackness which is implied. The *Αἰθίοπες* were the "burntfaced people" (*quos India torret*, as Tibullus says of them, II. 3, 59), and are described as perfectly black (*Jeremiah* xiii. 23; *κυάνεοι*, Hes. *Op. et Dies*, 525); whereas the *Πέλοπες* were only dark in comparison with the Hellenes[1]. On the whole, it can hardly be doubted that the *Πελασγοί* were, according to the name given them by the old inhabitants of Greece, "the swarthy Asiatics," who were called by the latter part of their name along the coasts of Asia Minor; and thus the cognate terms *Πέλ-οπες* and *Πελ-ασγοί* point to an emigration from Asia Minor to Argolis indisputably connected with the progress of Phœnician civilization. The former part of the name was not necessary in the mother-country, where all were dark complexioned; and the latter part of the word, which denoted the Asiatic origin of the *Πελ-ασγοί*, was dropt in the synonym *Πέλ-οψ*, which signifies merely "swarthy of face[2]."

§ 2. *How the Pelasgians came into Europe.*

Tradition and etymology agree, therefore, in tracing the Pelasgians, so called, to the western and northern coast of Asia Minor. There is, however, little or no reason to doubt that the

---

[1] Asius makes Pelasgus spring from the *black* earth (ap. Pausan. VIII. 1, 4):

> *ἀντίθεον δὲ Πελασγὸν ἐν ὑψικόμοισιν ὄρεσσι*
> *γαῖα μέλαιν' ἀνέδωκεν, ἵνα θνητῶν γένος εἴη.*

But here the adjective is nothing but an *epitheton constans*.

[2] For further arguments in support of this etymology, which is also applicable to the word *πελαργός*, as the stork, or "black but whitened bird," the reader is referred to the *N. Cratyl.* § 95. Mr Paley has suggested a similar explanation of the doves of Dodona, who bring the Phœnicians, Pelasgians, and Egyptians, into a sort of confusion with one another (Herod. II. 54, sqq.). He says (Æsch. Suppl. Ed. 2. p. xiv.), referring to my view of the matter: "obiter moneo nigras hasce columbas (*πελειάδας*), quæ humana voce locutæ traduntur, non alias fuisse videri quam *πελὰς* quasdam, sc. *furvas* mulieres, ex Oriente profectas." It is curious that Mrs Hamilton Gray (*Hist. of Etrur.* I. p. 89) should have quoted the epithet "pale-face," applied to Europeans by the American Indians, in the same page with her derivation of *πελασγός* from *πέλαγος*, which is simply irreconcilable with the laws of the Greek language.

bulk of the race, to which these "swarthy Asiatics" belonged, entered Europe in the first instance through the wide district of Thrace, which is always mentioned as the most ancient European settlement of this tribe. For although the legends about Pelops and Lydia make it probable that they subsequently crossed over the Ægean, leaving settlements as they sailed along in the islands of the Archipelago, and bringing with them perhaps some of that Semitic civilization which the Phœnicians and Egyptians had diffused over the eastern coast of the Mediterranean, and though the etymology of their name refers to some such migration from the sunny coasts of Asia, it is nearly certain that the main body entered both Greece and Italy from the north-east. The course of their wanderings seems to have been as follows. They passed into this continent from the western side of the Euxine, and spread themselves over Thrace, Macedonia, and Epirus; then, while some of them forced their way into Greece, others, again moving on to the north-west, eventually entered Italy near the mouth of the Po. At some time, however, during the period of their settlement in Thrace, and before they had penetrated to the south of Greece, or had wandered to Italy, they appear to have crossed the Hellespont and peopled the western coast of Asia Minor, where they founded the city of Troy, and established the kingdom of Lydia—names to which the Pelasgians in Italy and Argos looked back with mysterious reverence. It might be curious to inquire how the traditionary quarrels between the families of Dardanus and Tantalus contributed to produce the important Lydian migration into Greece; but such an investigation scarcely belongs to our subject. There seems to be good reason for believing that the Pelasgians acquired their distinctive character, that of agriculturists and architects, in the fertile plains of Asia Minor, and under that climate which was afterwards so prolific in works of art and genius. Those only of the Pelasgians who claimed a Lydian origin, namely those in Etruria and Argos, were celebrated as artisans and tower-builders.

§ 3. *Inferences derivable from the contrast of Pelasgian and Hellenic Architecture.*

The immediate derivation of even the later Greek architecture from Asia Minor may be proved by some combinations which

throw an important light not only on the history of ancient art, but on the ethnical affinities of the old inhabitants of southern and eastern Europe. It is well known that the Greeks or Hellenes descended from the north of Thessaly and conquered or incorporated themselves with the Pelasgo-Achæans, whom they found in the south of Greece. Now these Pelasgians, especially those who called themselves *Tyrrhenians* or "tower-builders," have left behind them numerous remains of their architecture, which are distinguished by immense blocks of solid stone built into rude masses of walls, towers, and treasuries, and are commonly called *Cyclopian*. It was of course this architecture which the Hellenes found in southern Greece, and as they were a warrior-tribe and less cultivated in every respect than their vassals, they must have adopted the same style of building. What origin then must we seek for the characteristic architecture of the Doro-Ionians—that which we commonly call Grecian architecture? The clue to the whole is furnished by that singular monument, the gate of the lions of Mycenæ, probably the oldest memorial of the primitive Achæans. We have here, at the entrance of a Cyclopian treasure-house, two lions trampling on an inverted column of Dorian architecture. With regard to the lions I feel no hesitation in rejecting Creuzer's supposition that we have here a Mithraic symbol[1]. This supposition springs from a total misconception of the object which stands between the lions, and affords no explanation of their duality. It can be shown, on the contrary, that it must be intended to indicate that the two lords of Mycenæ, some twin-power or duumvirate there, had conquered some place distinguished by the architecture of which the inverted column is a specimen. Whether the circumstance thus commemorated be a fact or a legend, we can hardly doubt that the two lions represent the two *Atreidæ* or sons of Atreus, the Pelopid or Lydo-Pelasgian prince of Mycenæ[2], and that the city captured and overthrown, the plunder of which they had stored up in their treasure-house, was the far-famed Troy. Both the duality of the conquerors of Troy, and the symbol of the lions as applied

---

[1] *Symbolik und Mythologie* (3rd Edit.) I. p. 267.

[2] The lion was a holy symbol of the Lydian kings; see Herod. I. 50; and Creuzer, *Symbol.* II. p. 633.

to them, are distinctly recorded in the *Agamemnon* of Æschylus[1]. If this explanation is correct, the inverted column represents Asiatic architecture, as opposed to the style of building then common in Greece and Italy, and which we call Cyclopian. From this inverted fragment we can restore the whole façade[2], and we see that it contains the elements of what was afterwards the Doro-Ionian architecture. We also see that it has many points of contact with the Lycian monuments. Now Pindar says that the Corinthians, among other useful arts, introduced the double tympanum or gable of the Dorian temple[3]. As therefore the Corinthians were the great traders and colonisers, it is sufficiently obvious that they must have derived this improvement in architecture from abroad, just as the introduction of the bridle-rein points to their mythical connexion, and commercial dealings with Lycia[4]: and since we see from the gate of the lions that the

---

[1] Cf. 42, sqq.:

Μενέλαος ἄναξ ἠδ' Ἀγαμέμνων
διθρόνου Διόθεν καὶ δισκήπτρου
τιμῆς, ὀχυρὸν ζεῦγος Ἀτρειδῶν.

with 796, 7:

ὑπερθορὼν δὲ πύργον ὠμηστὴς λέων
ἄδην ἔλειξεν αἵματος τυραννικοῦ.

[2] This has been done by Metzger, in Thiersch's tract, *über das Erechtheum.*

[3] *Olymp.* XIII. 21, sqq.:

ἅπαν δ' εὑρόντος ἔργον·
ταὶ Διωνύσου πόθεν ἐξέφανεν
σὺν βοηλάτᾳ χάριτες διθυράμβῳ;
τίς γὰρ ἱππείοις ἐν ἔντεσσιν μέτρα
ἢ θεῶν ναοῖσιν οἰωνῶν βασιλέα δίδυμον
ἐπέθηκε;

That the *αἰετὸς*, or *ἀέτωμα*, meant the tympanum, or gable, and not any figures within or upon it, has been fully shown by Bröndsted, *Voyages et Recherches en Grèce*, II. p. 154; and by Welcker, *Alte Denkmäler*, I. p. 3, sqq. The pediment was originally open; the deep relief, or rather complete figures, which appear in it, indicate the original practice, when it might be said in the language of Euripides (*Fr. Hypsip.*):

ἰδοὺ πρὸς αἰθέρ' ἐξαμιλλῶνται κόραι
γραπτοὺς [ἐν αἰε]τοῖσι προσβλέπειν τύπους.

And the ground was subsequently painted blue to recal the darkness of the space under the roof.

[4] The commercial dealings were a fact; the mythology of Bellerophon was a poetical record of it.

Dorian façade existed in Asia Minor long before the Dorian and Ionian colonies were established there, it is a fair conclusion that the Dorian and Ionian architecture, like the distinctions of dialect, was due to the reaction of the Dorian and Ionian colonies on the mother-land. And thus we see that all the architecture of Greece, the more refined porch as well as the ruder masses of Cyclopian masonry, was imported from the sunny land to which we trace the name of the Pelasgians. We may go a step farther, and say that the more recent architecture of Asia Minor, which was afterwards naturalized in Greece, was due to the Semitic tribes which extended inland from Lydia to Assyria and Egypt, whereas the Cyclopian architecture was strictly Indo-Germanic. The primary distinction between the Pelasgo-Achæan and the Doro-Ionian architecture consisted in the materials which they respectively adopted, the former being the adaptation of huge masses of uncemented stone, the latter the result of the best arrangement of beams and joists. The materials of the Cyclopian walls require no comment, but a few remarks may be necessary to show that the Doro-Ionian architecture originated in wood-carpentry. The simplest form of this architecture is the apteral temple *in antis*. This has no column or portico, the porch being supported by παραστάδες or *antæ*, i. e. projections of the side walls[1]. We then come to the prostyle, with a vestibule supported by columns beyond the *antæ;* then to the amphiprostyle, with such a termination at each end; and finally to the peripteral temple, surrounded by columns, like the Parthenon. The complete form is the best exemplification of the tectonics or carpentry in which the architecture originated. If we compare the Doric building, as restored from the inverted column on the gate of the lions, with the remains of Lycian architecture[2], we shall see that the foundation consisted of trunks of trees, laid level and crossed at right angles by the trunks of other trees. On these last, as we see in the gate of the lions, the plinth of the column rested, and on this the torus. The shaft of the column was the trunk of a tree, and its capital originally nothing more than a plinth. On the top of the column was placed the architrave

[1] On the sense of παραστάς, or παστάς, I may refer to my note on the *Antigone*, 1173, p. 225, where I have collected all the authorities.

[2] See Thiersch, *iiber das Erechtheum*, p. 149, sqq.

or main beam of the entablature, and on this rested the frieze with holes immediately above the columns for the reception of the upper joists of the building. When these joists were inserted, their ends, ornamented by channels cut in the wood, were termed *triglyphs*, and the spaces between the triglyphs, which were flat wood, and upon which it was customary to nail up spoils taken in the chase, garlands, and sculptures, were called *metopes*, or intervals between the holes[1]. The frieze was surmounted by the cornice, which originated in transverse beams supporting the ἀμιλλητῆρες of the sloping roof, and the façade was finished off by the pediment, tympanum, or ἀέτωμα, which was originally an open gable formed by the sloping rafters. Now every detail in this form of edifice points to wood-work or carpentry, which always constituted the material of pure Semitic architecture. The complete details which have been preserved of the temple of Solomon, which was a masterpiece of Phœ-

[1] It has been the opinion of many learned architects that the metopes, or spaces between the beam-ends, were originally hollow. This is an opinion contrary to the evidences furnished by the Greek language and by the Greek authors, and is plainly overthrown by the Mycenæan monument, which shows us that the frieze was originally a solid piece with holes for the beam-ends. The word ὀπὴ means "an opening or hole," i. e. the bed of a beam; hence the Roman architects called the triglyphs *cava columbaria*, or "pigeon-holes." The word μετόπη must signify "a space between ὀπαί," as τὸ μεταίχμιον means "a space between two armies;" consequently the metope could not have been itself a cavity. Besides, spoils taken in the chase, garlands, and sculptures, were *nailed* up to the frieze, which must therefore have been solid. The triglyphs were the ornamented ends of the beams, cut short on a line with the frieze: but these beams could not have projected in the same plane in the sides and at the ends of the building. Supposing then that those which ran the whole length of the building terminated in the frieze of the portico, the cross-beams must have rested upon them and served as supports to the end of the roof. Consequently the frieze on the sides of the building must either have had hollow spaces instead of beams, which was of course the original form, or they were filled by imaginary beam-ends, i. e. mere triglyphs. When the façade of a temple was imitated on the Greek stage, it seems that the ὀπαὶ or beds of the beams were left open, i. e. there were large holes through which a man might crawl. This enables us to understand such passages as the following: Euripid. *Iph. T.* 113: ὥρα δέ γ' εἴσω τριγλύφων ὅποι κενὸν δέμας μεθεῖναι. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 126: ὁ δ' ἐξεδίδρασκε διά τε τῶν ὑδρορροῶν καὶ τῶν ὀπῶν.

nician workmanship, show how the most costly and elaborate building could be erected without the assistance of the stonemason[1], and the ivory palaces of Solomon[2] were also specimens of the same application of art with that which appeared in the chryselephantine statues of Phidias. The very fact that the Doro-Ionian architecture, in its original and oldest type, not only admitted but required polychrome decorations, indicates that the materials employed must have been wood and metal, not stone, in the first instance. And the result of the whole discussion is to confirm our previous inference, that the Pelasgians were an Indo-Germanic tribe, who passed by the north of the Euxine into Europe, and recrossed into Asia Minor by the Hellespont, where they came into direct contact with Semitic art and civilization. All tradition confirms this, and the ready adoption by the Hellenes of the Asiatic, as opposed to the Cyclopian architecture, cannot be regarded as altogether unconnected with the ethnographical fact that the Dorians or Hellenes were a tribe which passed through Asia Minor in a strong but narrow stream on their way from the mountains of Caramania to the highlands of western Germany and northern Greece[3].

§ 4. *Supported by deductions from the contrasted mythology of the two races.*

These views of the Cyclopian architecture, as distinctively characterizing the Pelasgians, are confirmed by all that we know of their religious system. The worship of the Pelasgians was not only elementary; it not only consisted in an adoration of the great objects of nature—for this was common to it with other primitive tribes;—but it was especially a sun-worship, like that of the Medes, from whom, as we shall see, they trace their legitimate descent. Thus, while the so-called *aborigines* of Italy worshipped *Saturnus-Ops*, the divinity of the earth[4], the Pelasgo-Tyrrhenians who dwelt beside them worshipped *Tina* or *Janus*, the God of light. The two tribes, who constituted the original *populus*, being especially warriors, worshipped the God of war;

[1] For the details of Solomon's Temple, see Thenius, *über die Bücher der Könige*, Anhang. p. 25, sqq.

[2] *Psalm* xlv. 8; cf. 1 *Kings* xxii. 39; *Amos* iii. 15.

[3] *New Crat.* § 92.

[4] See Zumpt's Essay on this subject.

as Romulus was mythically the son of *Mars*, we may conclude that *Mars* or *Mamers* was the God of the Ramnes; and then *Quirinus*[1] would be the spear-god of the *Tities*. Just in the same way, the Hellenes, who, as I have shown in another place, were a warlike tribe of high German character[2], brought into Greece their war-god *Apollo*[3], a sort of refined Woden; but eventually allowed some of his attributes to be absorbed by the God of light, who was worshipped by the Pelasgians[4]. The Hyacinthia, which were retained by the Dorians in Laconia and applied to the worship of their own Apollo, were a festival of Achæan or Pelasgian origin, and symbolically expressed the triumph of the sun's disk over the rainy months of winter[5]. All the Pelasgian religion, wherever it can be discerned under the incrustations of later Hellenism, points to the same worship of the sun. Jupiter and Danae, of whose union the Argive Perseus was the fruit, represent the golden showers of the fructifying sky descending on the dry earth (δανάη γῆ)[6]. The Argive goddess Juno is called βοῶπις, as being a representative of the moon-goddess, who bore her disk between two horns, and who is thus identified with *Io*, "the earth," the daughter of Inachus[7]. In the same way Europa, the "broad-faced" moon, is borne across the sea from east to west by Jupiter in the form of a bull, that is, the sun in Taurus in conjunction with the moon rises from the eastern waves. Here she assumes the functions of Ἄρτεμις ταυροπόλος, and as we shall see, *Artemis*, which, in the Pelasgian language, was *Ari-timis*, and means "the virgin of the sea," becomes identical with Ἀρέ-θουσα, "the virgin swiftly moving[8]," for the idea of time finds one of its natural

---

[1] As the *Quirinal* was the first seat of the Sabines coming from the north, it may be inferred that *Janiculum* across the river indicated the first approximation of the Tyrrheno-Pelasgian worshippers of *Tina* or *Janus*, who formed a new element in the state under Vivenna of Cære. See Chapter I. § 18.

[2] *New Crat.* § 92.

[3] Ἕλληνες "the warriors;" Ἀπέλλων, "the fighter." Müller, *Dor.* II. 6. § 6.

[4] *Theatre of the Greeks*, (Ed. 6), p. [20].

[5] *New Crat.* § 464.

[6] See Müller's *Mythol.* p. 252, Engl. Tr.

[7] See Paley, *Præf. ad Prom.* p. xx. *ad Suppl.* p. vii.

[8] Below, § 12; and Chapter V. § 6; see also *Yaçna*, p. 349. Burnouf.

expressions in that of flowing water[1]. Even the name κύκλωψ, which has furnished a designation for the peculiar architecture of the Pelasgians, must refer to figures adorned with the sun's disk, rather than to any monophthalmic symbols; and we shall see the same transition in the earliest seats of the Pelasgic race[2]. The connexion of the Pelasgi with the Sclavonians, which will clearly appear in the sequel, brings them into close contact also with the early Celtic tribes. Now there can be hardly any doubt that the circular and megalithic structures, which are found in Britain and elsewhere, belong to the elementary worship of the early Celts. These buildings, whether grown in trees, as a grove, or built up in massive stones, represented the world; and this is the true interpretation of Arthur's Round Table. It was "made by Merlin for a type of the Round World, and was given by Pendragon to Gogyrvan father of Gwenhwyvar, who brought it to Arthur as her dowry (*Morte Arthur*, XIV. c. 2; IV. c. 1). From which we may collect that the true round table was the circular sanctuary erected by Merlin. The lake or pool under the *Dinas Emmrys* was likewise declared by Merlin to be *figura hujus mundi*, a type of this world (Nennius, c. 43[3])." And Arthur himself[4] "was the sun, honoured as a deity but figured as a warrior, i. e. as *Mithras*. His father's name, *Uthyr*, the Portent, is supernatural, and not really a name; least of all the name of a Roman, brother to Aurelius Ambrosius, and son to Constantinus. And the said *Uthyr* signifies in his Dirge, that he is the Azure Firmament (*id sublime candens quem invocant omnes Jovem*), and that the rainbow is his belt in battle. It follows of course, that the son or *eisillydd* (offspring) of *Uthyr Gorlassar*, who fills the place of Ormuzd, should be Mithras. And his twelve battles, in all imaginable parts of the island, correspond to the twelve Herculean labours." It is not unreasonable to conclude that the Celts, who carried to the uttermost parts of the West this purely Median worship of the God of Light, must have derived it from the Pelasgo-Sclavonians, who came most directly from the north of Media, who first touched upon and became mingled with the

---

[1] *New Crat.* § 270. [2] Below, § 12.

[3] *Cyclops Christianus*, G. A. Herbert. Lond. 1849, p. 191.

[4] Herbert, l. c. p. 213.

sporadic tribes of Celto-Turanians, and who in their original settlements, as Hyperboreans, and also as southern Pelasgians, were perseveringly devoted to this distinctive form of worship.

§ 5. *Thracians, Getæ, and Scythians.*

Beyond these particulars we have no satisfactory data for the migrations of the great Pelasgian people; and if we wish to know their original point of departure in Asia, we must turn to comparative philology and to ethnographical traditions of a different kind.

Our point of departure, in these further researches into the original abode and ethnical affinities of the Pelasgians, is the great country of Thrace, their first European settlement. The Thracians, according to Herodotus, were, next to the Indians, the greatest people in the world[1]; and Scylax tells us that their territory extended from the Strymon to the Ister[2]. Now, among these Thracians we find the two important tribes of Getæ and Mysians, or Mœsians. Of these the geographer Strabo speaks as follows[3]: "The Greeks considered the Getæ to be Thracians. There dwelt, however, on both sides of the Ister as well these Getæ as the Mysi, who are likewise Thracians, and are now called Mœsi, from whom also the Mysi now dwelling among the Lydians, Phrygians, and Trojans, derived their origin." Again,

---

[1] V. 2.

[2] *Geogr. Vet.,—Script. Min.* I. p. 27. It is singular that the name of the Thracians should seem to bear the same relation to *Tiras*, one of the sons of Japheth, that the ethnical names of the Medes and Ionians do to the names of two of his other sons, *Madai* and *Javan* (*Gen.* x. 2). If it were necessary to seek a connexion between the word Τυρσηνός and the Goth. *Thaúrsôs*, Old Norse *Thurs*, O. H. G. *Durs*, according to Grimm's suggestion (*Deutsche Myth.* pp. 23, 489, 2d ed.), we might with still greater safety bring the Thracians and the *Aga-thyrsi* into the same etymology. The Bithynians were Thracians; and there were Medo-Bithynians (Μαιδοὶ ἔθνος Θράκης, Steph. Byz. p. 527) as well as Parthians (οἱ Σκύθαι τοὺς φυγάδας Πάρθους καλοῦσι, Steph. Byz. p. 628) in Thrace. It is curious that the *Sintians* and *Mœdi*, whom Thucydides mentions (II. 98) as contiguous Thracian tribes, should represent a similar juxta-position in Irân, where those to the West and North were called *Medes* and *Sauro-Matæ*, while those to the South and East were termed *Sindians* or Indi.

[3] p. 295. He says also (p. 302), that the Getæ spoke the same language as the Thracians.

Scylax informs us that the Scythians bordered on the Thracians[1]; and Stephanus of Byzantium says expressly[2], that the Scythians were of Thracian extraction. The same is implied in what Strabo says on the subject: and it has long been admitted that Σκύθαι and Γέται are the same ethnical name. We thus at once obtain new data, reaching far beyond the limits of Hellenic tradition. For if the Pelasgians can fairly be traced to Thrace as their first traditionary settlement in Europe, and if we can pass from the Thracians to the Getæ, and from the Getæ to the Scythians, we are carried into a new field, in which our speculations immediately receive the support of comparative philology.

§ 6. *Scythians and Medes.*

The Scythians of Herodotus are represented as occupying the wide tract of country which lies to the north of the Euxine. Though there are some alleged differences, we can collect that the whole country between Media and the Danube was occupied by a series of cognate tribes. The earliest traditions represent these Scythians as in continual contact and collision with the Medes; and we receive many significant hints that the Scythians and Medes were ultimately connected with one another as kindred races. If we pursue this subject in its details, especially as illustrated by the fragments of the Scythian language which Herodotus and others have preserved, we shall see that the Pelasgians may be traced step by step to a primary settlement in Media or northern Irân.

§ 7. *Iranian origin of the Sarmatians, Scythians, and Getæ, may be shown* (1) *generally, and* (2) *by an examination of the remains of the Scythian language.*

The general proof that Irân, or the country lying between the Caspian, the Euphrates, the Indian Ocean, and the Indus, was the original abode of the Indo-Germanic race, has been given elsewhere[3]. It has also been shown, that within these limits were spoken two great branches of the one Indo-Ger-

---

[1] *Geogr. Vet.*,—*S. M.* I. p. 29.

[2] *De Urbibus*, p. 674. Berkel: Σκύθαι ἔθνος Θρᾴκιον.

[3] *N. Crat.* § 80, sqq.

manic language, which stood related to one another in much the same way as the Low and High German; the former being the older, and spoken by the inhabitants of Media, the northern half of this district. To these Medes, or, as they may be called, the *Northern* and *Low Iranians*, we refer, on the one hand, the *Hindus*, who call themselves *Arians* (*âryas*, "well-born"), for this was also the ancient name of the Medes; and, on the other hand, the following members of the Sclavonian and Low-German families:—(*a*) the *Sarmatæ* or *Sauromatæ*, an old Sclavonian tribe, who are expressly called "descendants of the Medes" both by Diodorus[1] and by Pliny[2], whose name, in the cognate Lithuanian language, signifies "the northern Medes or Matieni[3]," and who, under the slightly modified name of *Syrmatæ*, dwelt near the Indus[4]; (*b*) the *Sigynnæ*, or Sclavonian Wends, to whom Herodotus ascribes a Median parentage[5]; (*c*) the *Saxons*, *Sacassani*, or *Saca-sunu*, i. e. "sons of the Sacæ," who once occupied Bactriana, as well as the most fertile part of Armenia, and from thence forced their way into Europe[6]; and, above all, (*d*) the *Goths*, who, under the different local names of Γέται, Σ-κύθαι, i. e. *Asa-goths*, Θυσσα-γέται, or Τυρι-γέται, i. e. *Tyras-getæ*, or Goths dwelling by the Dniester[7], and Μυσοί,

---

[1] II. 43, p. 195. Dind. [2] *H. N.* VI. 7.
[3] Gatterer ap. Böckh, *C. I.* II. p. 83. [4] Plin. *H. N.* VI. 18.
[5] V. 9. Strabo, p. 520.

[6] Plin. *H. N.* VI. 11. Strabo, pp. 73, 507, 509, 511, 513. Among those who fought with *Visvâmitra* are mentioned (*Ramâyana*, I. c. 54, çl. 18), first, the *Pahlavi*, i. e. the Persians, for they were called *Pahlavi* by the Indians; and then a mixed army of *Sacæ* and *Yavani*, who covered the whole earth (*taîr âsit saṁvṛtâ bhûmih Çakair-Yavanam-içritaîh*). The Persians called the Scythians in general *Sacæ* (Herod. VII. 64: *οἱ γὰρ Πέρσαι πάντας τοὺς Σκύθας καλέουσι Σάκας*). A. W. von Schlegel (*ad loc. Ramây.* II. 2, p. 169) thinks that the name Ἰάϝων, the original form of Ἰάων, Ἴων, was not brought from Greece, but was learned by the settlers in Asia from the Lydians; and that the *Yavani* here mentioned by the Indian poet were the Greeks in general, who were always so called by the Indians, Persians, and Jews (*Schol. ad Arist. Acharn.* 106: *πάντας τοὺς Ἕλληνας Ἰάονας οἱ βάρβαροι ἐκάλουν*).

[7] If we wished to bring the *Thyssa-getæ* or *Thyrsa-getæ* into connexion with the *Aga-thyrsi*, and into closer contact with the *Asa-getæ* or *S-cythæ*, we might suppose that *Asa-getæ* and *Thyrsa-getæ* were other forms of *Asa-jötun* and *Thursa-jötun*, in which *As* "deus" and *Thurs* "gigas" would stand in the usual opposition. (See *Edd. Sæmund.* II. *Spec. Gloss.* p. 861).

Μοισοί, or Μασσα-γέται, i. e. *Mœso-goths*[1], occupied the whole of the districts which extend from the north-east of Irân to the borders of Thrace[2].

Although these general results are already established, the details of the subject have not yet been sufficiently examined, especially as regards the fragments of the language spoken by these northern and western scions of the great Median stock. It is in accordance with the main object of this treatise, that these details should be followed as far as they will lead us; and it is hoped that, by an analysis of all the Scythian words and names which Herodotus and others have preserved, the affinity of the Scythians to the Medes will be confirmed by the most decisive proofs, and that it will appear that the Pelasgians, whom tradition traces to the same regions, were members of the Sclavonian race.

§ 8. *Mode of discriminating the ethnical elements in this chain of nations.*

One caution must be given at the very beginning of all these inquiries concerning the chain of tribes which link together the extreme points of Indo-Germanic migration. As I have remarked before, it is always easier to perceive resemblances than to recognise distinctions; and the ancient writers speak of Thracians, Getæ, and Scythians as identical, because they have points of contact and common ingredients. The results of researches, which have been indicated elsewhere, tend to show that although the bulk and substratum of the ancient population of Thrace was Pelasgian, and this again Sclavonian, the warlike tribes, which gave a name to the nation, were identical in origin and title with the *Dorians*, who were the distinctive Hellenes, and with the *Hermun-duri* or Thuringians, who were the High-Germans or *Herminones* properly so called[3]. *Teres* or *Tereus* is a local

[1] Zeuss (*die Deutschen*, p. 280) is induced by some misspelling in the text of Ptolemy (III. 5, 10) to write *Tyrag-etæ*, *Massag-etæ*, thus repudiating all connexion with the *Getæ*.

[2] The traditions of the Goths referred not merely to Asia in general, but in particular to their *Midum-heime*, or "Median home," as the point of their departure (Ritter, *Vorhalle*, p. 473).

[3] *New Crat.* § 92.

name in *Doris* or *Daulis* as well as in Thrace[1]; and the latter country must at least have retained some fragments or droppings by the road-side of that united band of warriors who forced their way in one unbroken stream from the highlands of Kurdistan across the north of Asia Minor, and so through Thrace, sending forth conquering offshoots into Greece to the left and into Eastern Germany on their more direct route[2]. The *Getæ*, on the other hand, wherever they were pure from any Sclavonic admixture, stand as Low-Germans in direct opposition to the Sclavonians. As *Massa-Getæ* or *Mœso-Goths* they were mixed up with Mysians, who were Pelasgo-Sclavonians; and there was the same mingling of the Sclavonian and Low-German elements in the Lithuanians or *Samo-Getæ*. As *Daci* or Danes the pure Low-Germans stand opposed and related[3], both in the north and south, to the *Getæ*, whether called by this name, or designated as *Goths*, *Guddas*, *Jutes*, and *Vites*: and there is every reason to believe that the latter in this opposition represent some admixture of the Sclavonic and pure Gothic elements analogous to that which is presented by the Lithuanians or *Samo-Getæ*. In the Greek comedies *Davus* = *Dacvus*, and *Geta*, stand on a parallel footing as the names of slaves; but the countries from which these slaves came were distinguished as *Dacia* and *Mœsia*, and the latter was, at least to a considerable extent, Sclavonic. In the north, according to the legend[4], the *Dani* or *Dacini*[5] were settled in the islands as opposed to Jutland, or, as it is called, *Vithes-lœth*; and in the peninsula itself the stratification of Sclavonians in Schleswig, Angles or pure Low Germans in Jutland, and High Germans in Holstein, is still very distinct. In the immense area to which the ancients gave the name of Scythia, we must distinguish between the *Sarmatæ* or *Sauromatæ*, who were mainly or to a large extent Sclavonian, the *Scythæ* or *Asa-Goths*, who were mainly or to a large extent Low-German, the *Sacæ* or

---

[1] Thucyd. II. 29.

[2] The derivation of Greek poetry from Thrace, and the Pierian resting-places at the foot of Olympus in the North, and at the foot of Parnassus and Helicon in the south of Thessaly, point to the route of these Thraco-Hellenic emigrants.

[3] They both spoke dialects of the Thracian language; Strabo, pp. 303, 305.

[4] Zeuss, *die Deutschen*, p. 508, sqq.

[5] Grimm, *Gesch. der deutschen Sprache*, p. 192.

Saxons, who were purely Low German, and therefore identical ultimately with the *Daci* or Danes, and the *S-colotæ* or *Asa-Galatæ*, also called *Cimmerii*, who were mainly Celtic. And besides all these, we must allow a substratum or fringe of Mongols or Turano-Scythians. Nevertheless, the Sclavonian is the prevalent or qualifying element throughout, and from Thrace to Media we identify this with the Pelasgian. For the old statements, which class together the Thracians, Getæ, Mysians, and Scythians, can only be understood as asserting their ethnical affinity: that is, the Greeks saw that they had something in common. Now if the Dorians are to be derived from the Thracians so called, if Massa-geta or Mœso-Goth presumes a combination of different ingredients, the Mysian and Gothic, and if, which every thing conspires to show, the non-Hellenic element in Greece is also to be sought in Thrace; it follows that this element, or the *Pelasgi*, must be referred to the Mysians, who appear as the Pelasgian inhabitants of Asia Minor. The same must also be the link of connexion between the Thracians and the Scythians or Asa-Goths. But the Goths, when qualified by admixture in their primary settlements, are always blended with Sclavonian elements. Therefore the Mysians or Pelasgians were Sclavonian also. The Rhoxolani and Sarmatæ, who occupied the province of Dacia after the time of Aurelian, belonged to the same Gothic and Sclavonian races respectively as the original inhabitants; and though historically a change must be indicated, an ethnographical identity with the original population is still maintained by the Walachians, who had adopted a corruption of the Latin tongue before they received this addition of homogeneous ingredients[1].

§ 9. *Peculiarities of the Scythian Language suggested by Aristophanes.*

The Scythian words, which have been preserved by the ancients, are names of rivers, places, and persons; designations of deities; and common terms. Before we consider these separately, it will be as well to inquire if there are not some general principles by which the characteristics of the language may be ascertained.

Some of these general conclusions may be derived from Aristophanes. It is well known that the police of Athens con-

[1] Zeuss, p. 263.

sisted of Scythian bowmen. Accordingly, when the great comedian introduces one of these public servants on the stage, we might expect that, as he imitates the broad dialects of the Bœotians and Megarians, and the pure Doric of the Spartans, he would also give an accurate representation of the broken Greek of these barbarian functionaries[1]. When we mimic the provincialisms of the Highlanders or the Welsh, we are careful to substitute tenues for medials; and in the same way, we may suppose, Aristophanes would represent the leading peculiarities of the Scythian pronunciation of Greek. Now we find that his Scythian bowman in the *Thesmophoriazusæ* consistently omits the final -ς or -ν of Greek words, substitutes the lenis for the aspirate, and once puts ξ for sigma. We should expect, therefore, that the Scythian language would present us with *Visargah* and *Anuswârah*, would repudiate aspirated consonants, and employ ξ=*sh* instead of the ordinary sibilant. While this is the case with the fragments of the Scythian language which still remain, it is even more remarkable in the old idioms of Italy. In fact, these peculiarities constitute, as we shall see in the sequel, some of the leading features by which the Italian languages are distinguished from the dialects of ancient Greek.

§ 10. *Names of the Scythian rivers derived and explained.*

The names of the Scythian rivers, which Herodotus enumerates, will first engage our attention. These names are materially corrupted by the Greek transcription; but with the help of the general principles which have just been stated, we shall be able to analyse them without much difficulty.

Beginning from the European side, the first of these rivers is the *Is-ter*, or, as it is now called, the *Don-au* or *Dan-ube*. If we follow the analogy of our own and other countries, we shall observe that local names very often consist of synonymous elements; from which we may infer that the earlier parts of the word have successively lost their significance. Thus, the words *wick*, *ham*, and *town*, are synonymous, though belonging to different ages of our language; and yet we have compounds such as *Wick-ham* and *Ham*[*p*]*-ton-wick*. The words *wan*,

---

[1] See Niebuhr, *Kleine Schriften*, II. p. 200 (*über das Ægyptisch-Griechische*).

beck, and *water*, are synonymous; and yet we find a stream in the north of England called *Wans-beck-water*. The words *nagara* and *pura* in Sanscrit both signify "city;" but we find in India a city called *Nag-poor*. In the same way, we believe that both parts of the word *Is-ter* denote "water" or "river." The first part of the word is contained in the name of our own river *Thames*, or *Tam-isis*, the upper part of which is still called the *Is-is:* the second part we shall discuss directly, in speaking of the third Scythian river. The other and more recent name, *Dan-ub-ius*, also contains two elements, each signifying "water" or "river." The latter part is found in the Gaelic *ap*, and in our *Avon*, &c.; the former in most of the Scythian rivers, as will presently appear.

The next river is the *Por-ata* or *Pruth*, which obviously contains the same root as the Greek word πόρος and the Scythian *paris*.

The third river is called by Herodotus the Τύρ-ης, and is now known as the *Dnies-ter* or *Danas-ter*. The latter part of this name is the same as the latter part of *Is-ter*. The first part of the compound is the commencement of the other name of the *Is-ter*. In the transcription of Herodotus, either this word is omitted, and the *Danas-ter* is mentioned merely as the *Ter*, or the last syllable of Τύρ-ης represents the first syllable of the *Is-ter;* so that the *Danube* was called the *Is-ter*, and the *Dnies-ter* the *Ter-is*. It is singular that the syllables *Dan-*, *Don-*, or *Dun-*, and *Ter-* or *Tur-*, are used in the Celtic and Pelasgian languages respectively to signify "height," or "hill," or "hill-tower;" and it is to be supposed that this was the origin of their application to the river, which flows rapidly down from its birth-place in the mountains[1].

The river *Hypan-is* is called, according to the Greek transcription, by a name compounded of the Celtic *Apan* (*Avon*) and the word *is-*, which we have just examined. The first part of the word occurs also in the name of the river *Hypa-caris*, which means the water of *Caris*. The root of the second part of this name appears in the names of the city *Car-cine*, and the river *Ger-rus*, which flowed into the *Car-cinitis sinus* by the same

[1] Coleridge has, with much poetical truth, designated a cataract as "the son of the rock" (*Poems*, Vol. II. p. 131).

mouth as the *Hypan-is* and *Hypa-caris*. It would also seem that the exceedingly corrupted name *Pan-ticapes* began originally with the same word: the meaning of the last three syllables is absolutely lost, and they will scarcely be sought in the modern name *Ingul-etz*, of which we can only say that the last syllable represents the root *is-*; comp. *Tana-is*, *Tana-etz*[1].

The Greeks who dwelt near the mouth of the great river *Borysthenes* naturally pronounced the native name of the river in the manner most convenient to their own articulation; and the name, as it stands, is to all outward appearance a Greek word. This circumstance has deceived the ablest of modern geographers, who derives the first part of the word from Βορῆς or Βορέας. There is little difficulty, however, in showing that the name is identical with that by which the river is known at the present time,—the *Dnie-per* or *Dana-paris*, with the last part of which we may compare the name *Porata* or *Pruth*. It is well known that the northern Greeks were in the habit of substituting the medial, not only for the tenuis, but even for the aspirate; thus we have *βύργος* for *πύργος*, Βερενίκη for Φερενίκη, *δανεῖν* for *θανεῖν*, and Βόσ-πορος for Φώσ-φορος. Accordingly, their pronunciation of the word *Dana-paris* (=*Paris-danas*) would be *Dana-baris*, or, by an interchange of the two synonymous elements, *Baris-danas*[2]. But the Greek ear was so familiar with the sequence *σθ-*, that the *sd-* would inevitably fall into this collocation; and, with a change of vowels, for the same purpose of giving the barbarous name a Greek sound, the compound would become the Hellenic form Βορυσθένης, a word which has hitherto eluded etymological analysis.

The *Tana-is* was the most easterly of Scythian, and indeed of European rivers. The explanation of the name is implied in what has been already stated. No difficulty can arise from the appearance of a tenuis instead of the medial, which generally

---

[1] The identification of the *Ingul-etz* with the *Pan-ticapes* depends upon the position of the *Hylœa*, or "woodland" district, which must have been on the right bank of the Borysthenes, for the other side of the river is both woodless and waterless (see Lindner *Skythien*, Stuttgart, 1841, p. 40, sqq.). The name *Ingul* is borne by another river, which may be identified with the *Hypa-caris*.

[2] A similar change has taken place in the name *Berezina*.

appears in the first part of this name; for the Danube, which is most consistently spelt with the medial, is called the *Tun-owe* in the *Niebelungen-lied* (v. 6116). The *Tanais* seems to have been the same river which the Cossacks still call the *Donaetz* or *Tanaetz*.

We find the word *Dana-s* in composition not only with the synonyms *Is-*, *Ap-*, *Paris*, and *Ter*, but also with *Rha-*, which occurs in the names of the Asiatic *A-ra-xes*, and in that of the *Rha-*, or *Wolga*. Thus, we have the *E-ri-danus* in Italy, the *Rha-danau* in Prussia, the *Rho-danus* in France, and the name Ῥοῦ-δον, quoted by Ptolemy. In England the name *Dana* occurs by itself as "the *Don*."

§ 11. *Names of the Scythian divinities.*

Let us now pass to the names of the Scythian gods, which may be referred without any difficulty to the roots of the Indo-Germanic family of languages. Herodotus informs us (iv. 59), that the names by which the Scythians designated the Greek divinities, Ἱστίη, Ζεύς, Γῆ, Ἀπόλλων, Οὐρανίη Ἀφροδίτη, and Ποσειδέων, were Ταβιτί, Παπαῖος, Ἀπία, Οἰτόσυρος, Ἀρτίμπασα, and Θαμιμασάδας; and it is clear, from his manner of speaking of these and the Medo-Persian divinities (I. 131), that he is describing one and the same elementary worship.

Ἱστίη, or *Vesta*, was the goddess of fire, as Ovid tells us (Fast. VI. 291): "nec tu aliud *Vestam* quam *vivam* intellige *flammam*." There can be no doubt why the Medo-Scythians called her *Tabiti*, when we know that in the Zend and Sanscrit languages the root *tab-* or *tap-* signifies "to burn." Compare also the Latin *tab-eo*, *tepidus*, the Greek τῖφ-ος, the German *thau-en*, the new Persian *tebîden*, Sclavonian *teplye*, whence *Tœplitz*, "the hot baths," and the river *Tepel* at Karlsbad, the Oscan *teforom* (*Tab. Agnon.* vv. 17, 20), Etrusc. *tephral* (Orelli, 1384), &c. The same root may also appear in the Persian local names cited by Zeuss (*die Deutschen*, p. 286), namely Ταβιήνη between Caramania and Parthia, Ταβιάνα an island on the coast of Persia, Τάπη a city in Hyrcania, Ταπουροὶ or Ταπούρεοι, people in Media and on the Imaus.

Ζεύς, or Ζεὺς πατήρ (*Ju-piter*), was called Παπαῖος or "the Father," a name by which he was known to the Latins also. The primary labial sounds are appropriated in all languages to express the primary relation of parent and child. The

children on whom Psammitichus tried his experiment (Herod. II. 2) first uttered the articulate sound βε-κός, apparently the first labial followed by the first guttural; and in some articulations, as well as in the order of our alphabet, this is the natural sequence. To this spontaneous utterance of the first labials to designate the parental relation and the primary necessities of infancy, I have referred elsewhere (*N. Crat.* § 262); and it seems to have struck Delitsch also (*Isagoge*, p. 131), when he speaks of those nouns "quæ aboriginum instar sine verbi semine sponte provenerunt, velut אַב, אֵם, primi labiales balbutientis pueri, Sanscr. *pi-tri*, *ma-tri*, &c." The word παπαῖος shows us very clearly the connexion between the Persian and Sarmatian languages; for while in the Pehlevi, as Richardson tells us, (s. v. *bâb*) "the name *bâbâ* or *bâb* is given by way of excellence to express fire, which they worship as the *father* and principle of all things," we find *Babai* in Jornandes (cc. 54, 55) as the name of a Sarmatian king. According to Xenophon (*Cyrop.* VIII. 8, § 24) the Persians distinguished between Jupiter and the Sun, and he also speaks of separate sacrifices to *Vesta* and *Jupiter* (*Cyrop.* I. 6, § 1, VII. 5, § 57). But he may very well have confused between the different ingredients in this worship of fire.

The Scythian name for the goddess of the Earth is Ἀπία. This word actually occurs in Greek, as the name of the country where the Pelasgians ruled: and the root *Ap-* or *Op-* is of frequent occurrence both in Greece and in Italy (Buttmann's *Lexil.* s. v., and above, Ch. I. § 3).

As the Scythian religion appears to have exhibited an elementary character, we should expect that their Apollo would be "the god of the sun." And this seems to be the meaning of his name, as cited by Herodotus. Οἰτό-συρος should signify "the light or life of the sun." The second part of the word at once refers us to the Sanscrit *sûrya*, which is also implied in the σύριον ἄρμα of Æschylus (*Pers.* 86. *N. Crat.* § 473). The first two syllables may be explained as follows. After the loss of the digamma, the sound of *w* at the beginning of a word was often expressed by *o*: thus we have Ὄαξος = Ϝάξος; Ὄασις, with its modern equivalent *el Wah*; the Persian interjection ὄα (Æschyl. *Pers.* 116), which is doubtless the Greek representative of the oriental exclamation *wah*; the N. Test. οὐαί = *weh*; and the word οἶστρος, referring to the *whizzing* noise of the

gad-fly. Accordingly, Οἰτό-συρος, pronounced *Wito-suros*, signifies the *Uita*, Οἶτος, Αἶσα, or life of the sun: comp. the Russian *Vite*, signifying "a portion;" or if we prefer the cognate idea of light, we may compare the οἰτο- with *αἰθή*, *αἰθός*, *uitta*, *weiss*, "white," Egypt. *wit*, Copt. *oeit*, "to be white or brilliant," &c. As the *σύριον ἅρμα* seems to show that the Persian sun-god was sometimes known by a part of this Scythian name, we might be led to ask whether the Persian *Mithras* had not a representative in Scythia. Now we read not only that the Persians called the "Sun" *Mithras* (Strabo, p. 752: *τιμῶσι δὲ τὸν Ἥλιον, ὃν καλοῦσι Μίθραν*), but also that the Persians gave the name of *Mitra* to the heavenly Venus (Herod. I. 131: *ἐπιμεμαθήκασι δὲ καὶ τῇ Οὐρανίῃ θύειν, παρά τε Ἀσσυρίων μαθόντες καὶ Ἀραβίων. καλέουσι δὲ Ἀσσύριοι τὴν Ἀφροδίτην Μύλιττα, Ἀράβιοι δὲ Ἄλιττα, Πέρσαι δὲ Μίτραν*). From this it appears that the Persians had a pair of deities called *Mithras* and *Mithra*, and that the latter corresponded to the heavenly Venus. But the very dualism itself shows that she must have been a form of *Artemis*, the sister-goddess of *Apollo*, and therefore represented the moon. Thus Jul. Firmicus says (*de Err. Prof. Relig.* I. c. 5): "hi itaque [Magi et Persæ] Jovem in duas dividunt potestates, naturam ejus ad utriusque sexus transferentes, et viri et feminæ simulacra ignis substantiam deputantes." This pair of deities seems to be implied in the dual forms *ahuraêibya mithraêibya* in the *Yaçna*, which Burnouf translates (p. 351): "les deux seigneurs Mithras." But the most important authority for the present purpose is the inscription quoted by Zeuss (p. 289), from *Gudii Inscr. Antiquæ*, p. 56, 2, which should be read: ΘΕΑΙ . ΣΕΛΗΝΗΙ . ΟΙΤΟΣΚΥΡΑΙ . ΚΑΙ . ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙ . ΟΙΤΟΣΚΥΡΩΙ . ΜΙΘΡΑΙ . Μ . ΟΥΛΠΙΟΣ . ΠΛΟΚΑΜΟΣ . ΝΕΩΚΟΡΟΣ . ΑΝΕΘ. This shows that the epithet of the "sun" quoted as Scythian by Herodotus (with the mere change of σκ for σ to represent the sound *sh*: see *Maskil le-Sopher*, p. 8) is applicable to the moon as well as to the sun, and that *Apollo-Oitosyrus* was also *Mithras*. Now we know that Ἄρτεμις was specially worshipped by the Persians; for Plutarch says (*Vit. Lucull.* c. 24): *Περσία Ἄρτεμις ἣν μάλιστα θεῶν οἱ πέραν Εὐφράτου βάρβαροι τιμῶσι*, and her Persian name Ζαρῆτις (Hesych.) was probably connected with *Sûrya*; but if she was, as this investigation has shown, also identical with

the heavenly Venus or Mithra, we find her Greek name in Ἀρτίμπασα, the Scythian Venus: for, as we shall see, Ἀρ-τίμ is best explained out of the Scythian glosses, as "the virgin of the sea," and πασα signifies "the queen." The noun was probably Persian also, for *Artim-pasa* occurs on two inscriptions found near Tusculum and probably of Persian origin (Zeuss, p. 290). It is by no means clear what were the attributes of the celestial Venus of the Scythians; but her name thus explained corresponds exactly to the functions of *Europa*, the broad-faced moon, and to those of the Ἄρτεμις Ταυροπόλη.

The Scythian name for Neptune may be explained with almost demonstrable certainty. The general observations on the Scythian language have shown that they preferred the tenuis to the aspirate. The word Θαμιμασάδας must therefore have been pronounced *Tami-masadas*. Now, if we compare this word with the Scythian proper name *Octa-masadas* (Herod. IV. 80), we shall see that *masadas* must be the termination. In the Zend, or old Median language, *Mazdas* (connected with *maz*, "great"), signifies "a god," or "object of worship." So *Ormuzd* is called *Ahura-mazdas*, and a worshipper is termed *Mazdayasna*. Accordingly, *Tami-masadas* must mean "a god, or object of worship, with regard to *Tami*." When, therefore, we learn from Pliny, that *Temarunda* is equivalent to *mater maris*, we cannot doubt that *Teme*, or *Tami*, means "the sea," and that *Tami-masadas*, or "Neptune," is, by interpretation, "the god of the sea." It does not appear that the second part of the name *Temarunda* is a distinct word in itself. It seems more probable that it is a feminine termination, analogous to that of *Larunda*. For Pliny says (VI. 7); "Scythæ...vocant...Mæotim *Temarundam*, quo significant *matrem maris*." And as Μαῆτις, which seems to be another form of the Zend *mate* =*matis*, is stated by Herodotus (IV. 86) to mean μήτηρ τοῦ Πόντου, it is more than probable that *Temarunda* is a qualifying epithet of *Mœotis*, and that it denotes *maritima*. The word *Tama* perhaps signifies "broad water;" for the river which is called the *Is-is* while it is narrow, becomes the *Tam-is-is*, or "Thames," when it begins to widen. That the name of a man, like *Octa-masadas*, should be significant of veneration will not surprise those who recollect the Scythian name *Sparga-pises* (the son of Tomyris, Herod. I. 211), or *Sparga-pithes* (a king of the

Agathyrsi, id. IV. 78), which seems to be equivalent to the Sanscrit *Svarga-pati*, "lord of heaven"—*sparga* bearing the same relation to *svarga* that the Persian *açpa* does to the Sanscrit *açva;* and the Zend *çpan*, old Persian *çpaka*, Sclavonian *sabaka*, to the Sanscrit *çva* (*çvan*), Greek κύων.

§ 12. *Other Scythian Words explained.*

Leaving the names of divinities, we may turn to the scarcely less mythological *Arimaspi*. Herodotus says that they were a one-eyed people (μουνόφθαλμοι), and that their name indicates as much—ἄριμα γὰρ ἓν καλέουσι Σκύθαι, σπου δὲ τὸν ὀφθαλμόν. Eustathius (*ad Dionys.* 31) gives a different division of the compound, which Hartung would transfer to the text of Herodotus: ἄρι μὲν γὰρ τὸ ἓν Σκυθιστί, μασπὸς δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμός. It appears to me that Herodotus is in error respecting the meaning of the word, and that the true explanation is to be sought in the epithet ἱπποβάμων, which Æschylus (*Prom.* 830) applies to this people:

> ὀξυστόμους γὰρ Ζηνὸς ἀκραγεῖς κύνας
> Γρῦπας φύλαξαι, τόν τε μουνῶπα στρατόν,
> Ἀριμασπὸν ἱπποβάμον', οἳ χρυσόῤῥυτον
> οἰκοῦσιν ἀμφὶ νᾶμα Πλουτῶνος πόρον.

The position of the article before μουνῶπα shows that the words Ἀριμασπὸν ἱπποβάμονα are to be taken in close connexion, and apart from the epithet μουνῶπα; and I see in this fragment of symbolical mythology a trace of that Hyperborean sun-worship, which the Pelasgians brought from Media into Greece and Italy. For *Arim-aspas* is most naturally explained as *Ahurim-açpa*, or *Orim-açpa*, the "horse" or "horseman of light," thus explaining the term ἱπποβάμων, and the epithet μουνῶψ will refer to the circular disk which surmounted the head of the Sun-god, and so gave rise to a belief in Cyclopian or monophthalmic deities. With this view, the meaning of the fable is clear. The one-eyed, equestrian people dwelling in the Hyperborean regions, which are regarded as the inaccessible and ever-guarded sanctuary of the Sun, can only represent the Sun-god himself mounted on his heavenly courser (the *aurvat açpa*, "cheval rapide," of the *Yaçna:* Burnouf, pp. cxxxiv. 371); and the Gryfin, which

> Pursues the Arimaspian, who by stealth
> Had from his wakeful custody purloined
> The guarded gold—

is the *κέρβ-ερος* or כְּרוּב, which vainly seeks to prevent the golden light of day from being borne to the southern regions by the horseman of light[1]. In a communication read before the Royal Asiatic Society in January 1851, I have pointed out a similar error of Herodotus respecting the horse of Darius and his groom *Oibares;* and I have shown that, while this last name refers to the verb *vyabara*, or the noun *asbara*, which must have occurred in the original inscription, Darius, as in his other inscriptions, must have referred his power not to the ingenuity of a servant, but to the gracious help of *Ahura-mazda*, "the lord of light," and his celestial steed—the Sun.

Another compound, which may with equal facility be referred to the Indo-Germanic family of languages, is the name by which the Scythians designated the Amazons. *Οἰόρπατα*, according to Herodotus, is equivalent to *ἀνδροκτόνος—οἰὸρ γὰρ καλέουσι τὸν ἄνδρα, τὸ δὲ πατά, κτείνειν.* Now *οἰόρ* is clearly the Sanscrit *vîra*, the Zend *vairya*, *vîra* (Burnouf, *Yaçna*, p. 236), the Latin *vir*, Gothic *vair-s*, Welsh *gwyr*, and the Lithuanian *vyras*. The root *pat* in Sanscrit does not signify primarily "to kill," but "to fall;" though the causative form *pâtyati* constantly means "he kills;" *i. e.* "causes to fall." It seems more probable, however, that the Scythian articulation has substituted a tenuis for the *v*-sound, as in the case of *sparga* for *svarga*, mentioned above, and that the verb is to be sought in the common Sanscrit root *vadha*, "to strike," "to kill," "to destroy."

Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* VI. 17) tells us that the Scythian name for Mount Caucasus was *Grau-casis*, i. e. *nive candidus*. The first part of this word is clearly connected with *gelu, glacies, κρύος, κρύ-σταλλος, kalt, cold, grau*, and *grey;* and *casis*, "white," may be compared with *cas-tus, cas-nar* (senex *Oscorum lingua*, Fest.; comp. Varro, *L. L.* VII. § 29), *canus*, &c.

---

[1] Ariosto mixes up the horse of the Arimaspian with the Gryfin which pursued him, and in his joking way speaks of the composite animal as still extant in the northern regions: *Orlando Fur.* IV. 18:

> chiamasi Ippogrifo,
> Che ne i monti Rifei vengon, ma rari.

In the tract about rivers, printed among Plutarch's Fragments, we have the following Scythian words, with interpretations annexed. He does not translate ἀλίνδα, which he describes as a sort of cabbage growing near the Tanais (c. XIV. § 2): we may compare the word with *Temarunda*. He tells us, however, that βριξάβα means κριοῦ μέτωπον (c. XIV. § 4), that φρύξα is equivalent to μισοπόνηρος (c. XIV. § 5), and that ἀράξα signifies μισοπάρθενος (c. XXIII. § 2). Of these, βρίξ, "a ram," seems connected with *berbex*, *verbix*, or *vervex*. Ἄβα is probably akin to *caput*, *kapala*, *haupt*, &c.,—the initial guttural having been lost, as in *amo*, Sanscr. *kama-*. We may compare ξά, "to hate," with the German *scheu*, and the syllable φρυ (*phru*) in φρύ-ξα probably contains the element of *prav-us* (comp. the German *frevel*). If this analysis of φρύ-ξα is right, and if ἀρά-ξα really means μισο-πάρθενος, it follows that ἄρα means "a virgin." This leads us to some interesting deductions. In the first place, the Pelasgian goddess Ἄρ-τεμις, Etrusc. *Aritimis*, Scyth. *Ar-tim-pasa*, receives an appropriate explanation from the Scythian language. For, as we have seen, *temi* or *tami* means "the sea," and thus Ἄρ-τεμις, as "the virgin of the sea," connects herself with Europa, the broad-faced moon-goddess, who crossed the sea on the back of a bull (see Kenrick on Herodotus, II. 44, p. 71), and so Ἄρ-τεμις ταυροπόλος becomes identical with Ἀρέ-θουσα, "the virgin swiftly moving," who passes under water from Elis to Syracuse. Again, the root of ἄρα, "a virgin," seems unmistakeably connected with that of ἄρ-ης, ἀρε-τή, ἄρ-σην, denoting distinctive manliness. It may be doubtful whether the Scythian word ἐναρέες, "the unmanly," (Herod. I. 105) is compounded of *a* and *nri*, or of *an-* and *ar*. But it is clear that the root *ar* in the Indo-Germanic language was originally *var*, and the Scythian οἰόρ, as we have just seen, is the Sanscrit *vîra*. It is not at all improbable that the *anlaut* may have been dropt in the other word ἄρα, just as in Ἄρης, Ἄρ-τεμις. At any rate there is no doubt as to the connexion between *vir* and *virgo* or *virago:* compare the synonyms *Varro* and *Nero*, *wehren* and *nehrung;* &c. The mythology of Minerva and the etymology of *castus* may suffice to tell us how the ideas of protection, resistance, and virginity, are combined: and it is clear that the two former constitute the fundamental meaning of *vir* and ἄρης (*N. Crat.* § 285).

Herodotus (IV. 52) mentions a fountain the name of which was Σκυθιστὶ μὲν Ἑξαμπαῖος, κατὰ δὲ τὴν Ἑλλήνων γλῶσσαν, Ἱραὶ ὁδοί. Ritter (*Vorhalle*, p. 345) conjectures that the original form of Ἑξαμ-παῖ-ος must have been *Hexen-Pfad*, i. e. *Asen-Pfad*, which he compares with *Siri-pad*, and which denotes, he thinks, the sacred ominous road by which the Cimmerian Buddhists travelled towards the west. Böckh (*Corpus Inscript.* II. p. 111) supposes the right interpretation to be ἐννέα ὁδοί; so that ἑξάν is "nine." The numeral "nine" is preserved in a very mutilated state in all languages, both Semitic and Indo-Germanic, and it would not be difficult to point out a possible explanation of the word ἑξάν, if the reading ἐννέα ὁδοί were really certain. But there is more reason to suppose that the other interpretation is correct, and that ἑξὰν corresponds to the Zend *asja*, *aschavan*, *ashaun*, *ashaon*, "holy," so that the termination will be the Persian *pai*, Zend *pate*, "a path," and the compound will correspond to the Persian *Mah-pai*, *Satter-pai*, and will denote "Holy-road" or *Hali-dom*: cf. the Persian names Βαγα-παῖος and Βαγα-πάτης (Zeuss, p. 295).

This examination includes all the Scythian words which have come down to us with an interpretation; and in all of them it has been shown that they are connected, in the signification assigned to them, with the roots or elements which we find in the Indo-Germanic languages generally, and especially in the Medo-Persian idioms. If we add this result of philology to the traditionary facts which have been recorded of the international relations of the Getæ, Scythæ, Sauromatæ, and Medes, we must conclude that the inhabitants of the northern side of the Euxine, who were known to the Greeks under the general name of Scythians, were members of the Indo-Germanic family, and not Mongolians, as Niebuhr has supposed[1].

§ 13. *Successive peopling of Asia and Europe: fate of the Mongolian race.*

The true theory with regard to the successive peopling of Asia and Europe seems to be the following[2]. Believing that

---

[1] *Kleine Schriften*, I. p. 361.

[2] The author's views are given in the *New Cratylus* (2nd Ed.) § 64, sqq. and in the *Transactions of the British Association for* 1851, p. 138, sqq.

the human race originated in the table-land of Armenia[1], I give the name of *Central* to the two sister-races, the Semitic and

---

See also Winning's *Manual*, p. 124, sqq. Rask, *über das Alter und die Echtheit der Zend-Sprache*, p. 69, sqq., Hagen's Tr. And, for the affinity of the inhabitants of Northern Asia in particular, see Prichard *on the Ethnography of High Asia* (Journal of R. G. S. IX. 2, p. 192, sqq.).

[1] The general reasons for this opinion are given in the *New Cratylus*, § 64. But I am inclined to attach much more importance than some other ethnographers to the geography of Eden, as given in the book of Genesis; and I believe that the first seats of the human race are strictly defined by the four rivers there mentioned. Delitsch, in his recent Commentary on *Genesis* (p. 101, sqq.), has given a summary of all the leading views on the subject of these four rivers. In my opinion, the sacred writer wishes to indicate the immediate neighbourhood of the Caspian sea, a part of whose area may have corresponded originally to the once happy home of the family of man. At any rate, it is clear that physical changes have taken place in this region, and the book of Genesis implies that Eden no longer exists. Be this as it may, there can be no doubt that the sacred writer directs our view to a district from which there is a divergence of four great rivers. It does not follow that they all rose in this country, but this is true of the two which we have no difficulty in identifying, namely, the פְּרָת or *Euphrates*, and the חִדֶּקֶל or *Tigris*. The sources of these rivers point to the south of Armenia, and as no other rivers of great consequence, or answering to the definitions of the book of Genesis, take their rise in this district, we are naturally led to seek the other two רָאשִׁים, or main branches, in the two great rivers, the *Oxus*, and the *Rha* or *Wolga*, which terminate in the Caspian sea, and by this enormous confluence form the boundary of Armenia on the side opposite to the sources of the other rivers. It is worthy of remark that Pliny (VI. 18) makes the Oxus rise in the lake or sea in which it now terminates; and the same mode of speaking may be conceded to the sacred writer. Now it can be shown that the *Oxus* and the *Wolga*, which are the two greatest rivers in the district, the only two, in fact, which can be compared with the Tigris and Euphrates, answer exactly to the description given of the גִּיחוֹן and the פִּישׁוֹן. With regard to the former, not only does the river Oxus bear the name of *Jihon* as well as *Amoo*, but the description הַסּוֹבֵב אֵת כָּל־אֶרֶץ כּוּשׁ can only apply to this river which ran from the mountains of India (Strabo, p. 510) through the lake of Aral into the Caspian, and so furnished a northern boundary to the whole of the country which the Hebrews called *Cush*. The name of the פִּישׁוֹן, which signifies "water poured forth," or "over-flowing," corresponds to the meaning of *Rha* (ῥέω, &c.), and to the character of the *Volga* as described by its Tartar name *Ethel*, "the bountiful." The reasons

the Indo-Germanic, which formed themselves in Mesopotamia and Irân, and became the twin-mothers of human population, and the joint source and home of intellectual culture. To this central group, I oppose the *Sporadic*, as including all those nations and languages which were scattered over the globe by the first and farthest wanderers from the birth-place of our race. The process of successive peopling may be thus described. While the Indo-Germanic or Japhetic race was developing itself within the limits of Irân, and while the Semitic family was spreading from Mesopotamia to Arabia and Egypt, a great population of Tchudes, or Mongolians, Celts and Turanians, had extended its migrations from the Arctic to the Indian Ocean, and from Greenland over the whole north of America, Asia, and Europe, even as far as Britain, France, and Spain. In proportion, however, as these Celto-Turanians were widely spread, so in proportion were they thinly scattered; their habits were nomadic, and they never formed themselves into large or powerful communities. Consequently, when the Iranians broke forth from their narrow limits, in compacter bodies, and with superior physical and intellectual organisation, they easily mastered or drove before them these rude barbarians of the old world; and in the great breadth of territory which they occupied, the Turanians have formed only four great and independent states—the Mantchus in China, the Turks in Europe, and the Aztecs and the Peruvians in America.

The student of ethnography must bear in mind some essential differences between the spread of those Sporadic tribes, which derived their origin from *Irân*, and to which the aboriginal population of Europe, Asia, and America is due, and those which emigrated from Mesopotamia and Arabia, and furnished a substratum of dispersed inhabitants for Africa. Fôr while the

---

which led Reland, Rosemmüller, and Raumer, to identify this river with the *Phasis*, apply with still greater force, if we go farther north, and seek their justification in the great stream which skirts the Ural mountains. The mineral wealth of this district is well known, and the fact, that the land of *Chawîlâh* is found also in Arabia, does not prevent us from identifying this name with that of the *Chwalissi* who dwelt on the west of the Ural by the Volga, and to whom the Caspian owes its modern Russian name of *Chwalinskoye More*.

Sporadic Syro-Arabians in Africa exhibit, as we go farther from the center of their dispersion, a successive degeneration in the passage of the Aramaic languages from the Abyssinian to the Galla and Berber, from this again to the Caffre, from the Caffre to the Hottentot, and from the Hottentot to the clucking of the savage Bushman, and while there is no later infusion of civilized Semitic elements until the conquest of North Africa by the Arabs; on the other hand, the Celto-Turanian tribes were overrun or absorbed at a very early period by successive or parallel streams of Sclavonians, Lithuanians, and Saxo-Goths, flowing freely and freshly from the north of Irân; and the latest of these emigrants, the High-Germans, found many traces of similarity in the Celtic tribes with which they ultimately came in contact. Whatever might have been the degradation of the Ugro-Turanian races in those regions where they were most thinly scattered, it is obvious that the Scythia of Herodotus, which was the highway of the earliest march of Indo-Germanic migration into Europe, could not have been, as Niebuhr supposed, mainly peopled by a Tchudic or Mongolian stock. And though the name of *S-colotæ* or *Asa-Galatæ*, by which some of the Scythæ called themselves, may be regarded as pointing to a Celtic or Turanian intermixture, the great mass of the hordes which dwelt to the north of the Euxine must have consisted of Indo-Germanic tribes who conquered or ejected the Turanians; and I have no hesitation in referring these invaders, together with the Pelasgians of Greece and Italy, to different branches of the Sclavonian, Lithuanian, Saxo-Gothic, or generally Low Iranian stock.

§ 14. *The Pelasgians were of Sclavonian origin.*

It has been proved that the Sarmatians belonged to the parent stock of the Sclavonians; and we find in the Sclavonian dialects ample illustrations of those general principles by which the Scythian languages seem to have been characterised. Making, then, a fresh start from this point, we shall find an amazing number of coincidences between the Sclavonian languages and the Pelasgian element of Greek and Latin: most of these have been pointed out elsewhere[1]; at present it is only necessary to call

[1] *New Crat.* § 88.

attention to the fact. So that, whichever way we look at it, we shall find new reasons for considering the Pelasgians as a branch of the great Sarmatian or Sclavonian race. The Thracians, Getæ, Scythæ, and Sauromatæ, were so many links in a long chain connecting the Pelasgians with Media; the Sauromatæ were at least in part Sclavonians; and the Pelasgian language, as it appears in the oldest forms of Latin, and in certain Greek archaisms, was unquestionably most nearly allied to the Sclavonian: we cannot, therefore, doubt that this was the origin of the Pelasgian people, especially as there is no evidence or argument to the contrary.

§ 15. *Foreign affinities of the Umbrians, &c.*

But, to return to Italy, who were the old inhabitants of that peninsula? Whom did the Pelasgians in the first instance conquer or drive to the mountains? What was the origin of that hardy race, which, descending once more to the plain, subjugated Latium, founded Rome, and fixed the destiny of the world?

The Umbrians, Oscans, Latins, or Sabines—for, in their historical appearances, we must consider them as only different members of the same family—are never mentioned as foreigners. We know, however, that they must have had their Transpadane affinities as well as their Pelasgian rivals. It is only because their Celtic substratum was in Italy before the Pelasgians arrived there, that they are called aborigines. The difference between them and the Pelasgians is in effect this: in examining the ethnical affinities of the latter we have tradition as well as comparative grammar to aid us; whereas the establishment of the Umbrian pedigree depends upon philology alone.

§ 16. *Reasons for believing that they were the same race as the Lithuanians.*

Among the oldest languages of the Indo-Germanic family not the least remarkable is the Lithuanian, which stands first among the Sclavonian dialects[1], and bears a nearer resemblance to Sanscrit than any European idiom. It is spoken, in different

[1] See Pott, *Et. Forsch.* I. p. xxxiii. and his *Commentatio de Borusso-Lithuanicæ tam in Slavicis quam Letticis linguis principatu.* Halis Saxonum, 1837—1841.

dialects, by people who live around the south-east corner of the Baltic. One branch of this language is the old Prussian, which used to be indigenous in the *Sam-land* or "Fen-country" between the Memel and the Pregel, along the shore of the *Curische Haf*, and the Lithuanians are often called *Samo-Getæ* or "Fen-Goths." Other writers have pointed out the numerous and striking coincidences between the people who spoke this language and the Italian aborigines[1]. Thus the connexion between the Sabine *Cures, Quirinus, Quirites,* &c. and the old Prussian names *Cures, Cour-land, Curische Haf,* &c. has been remarked; it has been shown that the wolf (*hirpus*), which was an object of mystic reverence among the Sabines, and was connected with many of their ceremonies and some of their legends, is also regarded as ominous of good luck among the Lettons and Courlanders; the Sabine legend of the rape of the virgins, in the early history of Rome, was invented to explain their marriage ceremonies, which are still preserved among the Courlanders and Lithuanians, where the bride is carried off from her father's house with an appearance of force; even the immortal name of Rome is found in the Prussian *Romowo ;* and the connexion of the words *Roma, Romulus, ruma lupæ,* and *ruminalis ficus,* is explained by the Lithuanian *raumu,* gen. *raumens,* signifying "a dug" or "udder[2]."

---

[1] Perhaps the oldest observation of this affinity is that which is quoted by Pott (*Commentatio,* I. p. 6), from a work published at Leyden in 1642 by Michalo Lituanus (*in rep. Pol.* &c. p. 246): "nos Lithuani ex Italico sanguine oriundi sumus, quod ita esse liquet ex nostro sermone semi-latino et ex ritibus Romanorum vetustis, qui non ita pridem apud nos desiere, &c. Etenim et *ignis* (Lith. *ugnis* f.) et *unda* (*wandů* m.), *aer* (*ůras*), *sol* (*sáulé*) . . . *unus* (*wiênas*) . . . et pleraque alia, idem significant Lithuano sermone quod et Latino."

[2] See Festus, pp. 266-8, Müller; and Pott, *Etymol. Forsch.* II. p. 283. According to this etymology, the name *Romanus* ultimately identifies itself with the ethnical denomination *Hirpinus.* The derivation of the word *Roma* is, after all, very uncertain; and there are many who might prefer to connect it with *Groma,* the name given to the *forum,* or point of intersection of the main streets in the original *Roma quadrata,* which was also, by a very significant augury, called *mundus* (see Festus, p. 266; Dionys. I. 88; Bunsen, *Beschreib. d. Stadt Rom,* III. p. 81; and below, Ch. VII. § 6). The word *groma* or *gruma,* however, is not without its Lithuanian affinities. I cannot agree with Müller (*Etrusk.* II. p. 152), Pott (*Etym. Forsch.* II. 101), and Benfey (*Wurzel-Lexikon,* II. p. 143), who follow the old

Besides these, a great number of words and forms of words in the Sabine language are explicable most readily from a comparison with the Lithuanian; and the general impression which these arguments leave upon our mind is, that the Latins and Sabines were of the same race as the Lithuanians or old Prussians.

§ 17. *Further confirmation from etymology.*

Let us add to this comparison one feature which has not yet been observed. The Lithuanians were not only called by this name[1], which involves both the aspirated dental *th* and the vocalised labial *u*, but also by the names *Livonian* and *Lettonian*, which omit respectively one or other of these articulations. Now it has been mentioned before, that the name of the Latins exhibits the same phenomenon; for as they were called both *Latins* and *Lavines*, it follows that their original name must have been *Latuinians*, which is only another way of spelling and pronouncing *Lithuanians*. If, therefore, the warrior-tribe, which descended upon Latium from Reate and conquered the Pelasgians, gave their name to the country, we see that these aborigines were actually called Lithuanians; and it has been shown that they and the Sabines were virtually the same stock. Consequently, the old Prussians brought even their name into Italy. And what does this name signify? Simply, "freemen[2];" for the root

---

grammarians, and connect this word with the Greek *γνῶμα, γνώμη, γνώμων*: it is much more reasonable to suppose, with Klenze (*Abhandl.* p. 135, note), that it is a genuine Latin term; and I would suggest that it may be connected with *grumus*, Lithuan. *krúwa*, Lettish *kraut:* comp. *κρώμαξ, κλώμαξ, globus, gleba*, &c. The name may have been given to the point of intersection of the main *via* and *limes*, because a heap of stones was there erected as a mark (cf. Charis. I. p. 19). Even in our day it is common to mark the junction of several roads by a cross, an obelisk, or some other erection; to which the *grumus*, or "barrow," was the first rude approximation. If so, it may still be connected with *ruma;* just as *μαστός* signifies both "a hillock" and "a breast;" and the omission of the initial *g* before a liquid is very common in Latin, comp. *narro* with *γνωρίζω*, *nosco* with *γιγνώσκω*, and *norma* with *γνώριμος*.

[1] The known forms of the name are *Litwa, Lietuwa, Litauen, Lietuwininkas,* Λιτβοί, *Lethowini, Lituini, Letwini, Lethuini, Lettowii, Litwani, Letthones*, and *Letthi*.

[2] By a singular change, the name of the kindred Sclavonians, which in the oldest remains of the language signifies either "celebrated," "illus-

signifying "free," in all the European languages consisted of *l-* and a combination of dental and labial, with, of course, a vowel interposed. In most languages the labial is vocalised into *u*, and prefixed to the dental; as in Greek *ἐ-λεύθε-ρος*, Lithuan. *liaudis*, Germ. *leute*, &c.[1] In the Latin *liber* the labial alone remains.

§ 18. *Celtic tribes intermixed with the Sclavonians and Lithuanians in Italy and elsewhere.*

The name of the *Umbrians*, the most northerly of the indigenous Italians, leads to some other considerations of great importance. It can scarcely be doubted that in their northern as well as their southern settlements the Lithuanians were a good deal intermixed with Celto-Finnish tribes in the first instance, and subjected to Sclavonian influences afterwards. That this was the case with the Lithuanians, we learn from their authentic and comparatively modern history. The proper names cited by Zeuss (p. 229) show that there was a Celtic ingredient in the population of Rætia and Noricum. It appears, too, that in Italy there was a substratum of Celts before the Lithuanians arrived there; this is expressly recorded of the Umbrians by M. Antonius and Bocchus (*apud Solin.* c. 2.) and by Servius (*ad Virg. Æneid.* XII. 753), and the fact is clearly indicated by the name of the country, *Umbria*, and its principal river *Umbro*. If the oldest inhabitants of this country were Celtic, they must have been an offshoot of the Celtic race which occupied the contiguous district of Ligu-

---

trious" (from *çlava*, "glory," root *çlu*, Sanscr. *çru*, Gr. *κλυ-*: see 'Safafik, and Palacky's *Æltest. Denkm. der Böhm. Spr.* pp. 63, 140), or "intelligibly speaking," as opposed to barbarian (from *slovo*, "a word"), has furnished the modern designation of "a slave," *esclave, schiavo*. The Bulgarians, whom Gibbon classes with the Sclavonians (VII. p. 279, ed. Milman), have been still more unfortunate in the secondary application of their name (Gibbon, X. p. 177).

[1] Dr Latham says (*Germania of Tacitus*, Epilegom. p. cxi.): "the root *L-t = people* is German (*Leute*), yet no one argues that the *Lat-ins, Lithuanians*, and a host of other populations, must, for that reason, be German." If the people called themselves by this name, it may be fairly inferred that it was to them a significant term, and may therefore be taken as a mark of affinity: no Indo-Germanic philologer will deny that the Lithuanians and Germans were cognate races.

ria. Now not only are the *Ambrones* said to have been a Celtic race (*Ambrones*, says Festus, *fuerunt gens quædam Gallica*), but this was also the generic name of the Ligurians (σφᾶς γὰρ αὐτοὺς οὕτως ὀνομάζουσι κατὰ γένος Λίγυες, Plut. *Vit. Marii*, c. XIX.). Whatever weight we may attach to the statement in Festus, that they were driven from their original settlements by an inundation of the sea, we cannot fail to see the resemblance between the name of the *Ambrones* and that of the river *Umbro;* and no Englishman is ignorant that the *North-umbrians* are so called with reference to an *Ymbra-land* through which the river *Humber* flowed. Dr Latham (*Tac. German.* Epilegom. p. cx.) has suggested a connexion between a number of different tribes which bore names more or less resembling this, and he thinks that there is some reference in this name to the settlement of the race bearing it near the lower part of some river. Thus the *Ambrones* seem to have been on the Lower Rhine, the *Umbri* on the Lower Po, the *Cumbrians* of Cumberland on the Solway, and the *Gambrivii* and *Si-gambri* on the Lower Rhine. Dr Latham also conjectures that *Humber* may be the Gallic and East British form of the Welsh *Aber* and the Gaelic *Inver*="mouth of a river." It appears to me that the *Sigambri* and *Gambrivii* belonged to a German, not to a Celtic stock, and I am disposed to refer the name of *Cumber-land* to the form *Cymmry*. Nor do I think it reasonable to suppose that *Umber* or *Ambro* is a dialectical variety of *Aber* or *Inver*. But whether we are or are not to connect the word with *amhainn* or *amhna*, "a river," found in *Gar-umna*, it cannot be doubted that the name of *Umbria* points to a continuous population of *Ligurians* or *Ambrones* extending from the Cottian Alps to the Tiber; and there is every reason to believe that this was only part of a Celtic population which occupied originally the three peninsulas of Greece, Italy, and Spain, together with the great islands of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica. The first inhabitants of Spain and Sicily are called Iberians by every ancient writer, and they are identified with the Sicanians; and Philistus must have referred to these when he said that the Sicilians were Ligurians who had been driven southwards by the Umbrians and Pelasgians (Dionys. Hal. I. 22), meaning of course the Low-German and Sclavonian tribes, who subsequently occupied north Italy. With regard to Greece, there is no reason why the *Leleges*, whom we have other grounds for

considering as Celtic, should not be regarded as exhibiting the name of the *Ligyes* with that reduplication of the initial *l-* which is so universal in Welsh[1].

§ 19. *The Sarmatæ probably a branch of the Lithuanian family.*

If it is necessary to go one step farther, and identify this Lithuanian race with some one of the tribes which form so many

---

[1] Professor F. W. Newman, in his little work entitled *Regal Rome*, maintains that the old languages of Italy, especially the Umbrian and Sabine, contained a striking predominance of Celtic ingredients, and he wishes to show that this is still evident even in the Latin of Cicero. His proof rests on vocabularies (pp. 19—26), especially in regard to the military, political, and religious words, which he supposes that the Romans derived from the Sabines (p. 61). With regard to these lists I have to observe, that while all that is valid in the comparison merely gives the Indo-Germanic affinities of the Celtic languages—a fact beyond dispute—Mr. Newman has taken no pains to discriminate between the marks of an original identity of root, and those words which the Celts of Britain derived from their Roman conquerors. In general, Mr. Newman's philology is neither solid nor scientific. It is not at all creditable to a professed student of languages to compare the participial word *cliens* (*clie-nt-s*) with the Gaelic *clann*, *cloinne*, "children." If anything is certain about the former, it is clear that it contains the verb-root *cli-* or *clu-* with a merely formative termination in *nt*, which does not belong to the root. Again, when every one knows the Latin meaning of *tripudium*, referring to the triple ictus, what is the use of deriving it from the Gaelic *tir* "earth," and *put* "to push?" If *quir-i*[*t*]*-s* with a regular Indo-Germanic ending, is naturally derived from *quiris* "a spear," what miserable etymology it is to compare the former with *curaidh* "a champion," from *cur* "power," and the latter with *coir* "just, honourable, noble." And all regard for simple reasoning is neglected by a writer, who analyses *augur* = *avi-ger* into the Gaulish *auca* "a bird," and the Welsh *cur* "care." I am influenced only by a regard for the interests of sound learning when I express the strong feelings of dissatisfaction with which I have read most of Mr. F. W. Newman's books. With great natural abilities and the power of giving a specious and plausible representation of the views which he adopts, his self-reliance has led him to attempt a wide and very important range of subjects, with very inadequate preparation for their proper discussion; and thus in history, philology, biblical criticism, and political economy, he has contrived to exhibit himself as a rash and mischievous writer, and has done considerable damage to the good cause of independent thought and original investigation.

links of the chain between Media and Thrace, it would be only reasonable to select the *Sauromatæ*, whose name receives its interpretation from the Lithuanian language (*Szaure-Mateni*, i. e. "Northern Medes"). The Sauromatæ and the Scythæ were undoubtedly kindred tribes; but still there were some marked differences between them, insomuch that Herodotus reckons the Sarmatæ as a separate nation. Between the Pelasgians and the Umbrians, &c., there existed the same affinities, with similar differences; and the fairest conclusion seems to be this, that as the Latins or Lithuanians were a combination of Gothic and Sclavonian ingredients, so were the Sauromatæ; that as the indigenous tribes of Italy were pure Gothic, mixed with Celtic, so were the Scythæ or Asa-Goths. At the same time it must be remarked, that the term Sarmatian has a wider as well as a narrower signification. In its more extended meaning it is synonymous with Sclavonian, and therefore includes the Pelasgians. In its narrower use, it is expressive of that admixture of Sclavonian and Low-German elements which characterizes the Lithuanian or Samo-Getic languages, and in which the Sclavonian is so predominant that the Gothic element is almost overpowered. Reverting to the Asiatic settlements of these races, we may say, as we pass from West to East across the northern frontiers of the plateau of Irân, that the true Sclavonians extended from the borders of Assyria to those of Hyrcania and Parthia; that they there abutted on the debateable land or oscillating boundary-line between the Sclavonian and Gothic races, and so became Massa-Getæ or Lithuanians; and that the Sacæ, Saxons, or genuine Gothic and Low-German tribes, the Daci, Danes, and Northmen of Europe, occupied Sogdiana to the banks of the Iaxartes. If we suppose, what we have a right to suppose, that this line was preserved as the march of emigration wheeled round the north of the Caspian—the Sclavonians to the left, the Lithuanians in the centre, and the pure Goths to the right,—we shall have a simple explanation of all the facts in the ethnography of Eastern Europe. For these are still the relative positions of the different races. The right wing becomes in the course of this geographical evolution the most northerly or the most westerly, while the left wing or pivot of the movement becomes most southerly or most easterly, and the centre remains between the two. Thus the pure Low-Germans and the Lithuanians never come into Greece, which

is peopled by the Sclavonians. Lithuanian and Sclavonian are mingled in Italy. But although, as we shall see, a branch of the pure Gothic invaded that peninsula, it felt, to the end of its early history, that it had approached a distinct line of demarcation wherever it touched, without Lithuanian intervention, on the borders of pure Sclavonism.

§ 20. *Gothic or Low-German affinities of the ancient Etruscans shown by their ethnographic opposition to the* Veneti.

This brings us to the crowning problem in Italian ethnography,—the establishment of the foreign affinities of the ancient Etruscans. Wherever the advancing tide of Sclavonian emigration came to a check before the established settlements of a purely Gothic or Low-German tribe, wherever, consequently, the Sclavonians felt a need for a distinctive appellation, we find that they called themselves *Serbs, Sorbs,* or *Servians,* a name apparently denoting their agricultural habits, or else *Slow-jane, Slow-jene,* or *Sclavonian,* a name implying, according to the most recent interpretation, that they opposed their own language as intelligible to the foreign jargon of their neighbours. By these names they were known in the distant lands to which the wars of the ninth and tenth centuries transported them as captives; and as a foreign and barbarous slave was a Scythian in the older days of Athens, a *Davus* or *Dacian* and a *Geta* or *Goth* in the later comedies, so all prisoners were called indifferently *Slave* or *Syrf,* a circumstance which proves the identity and prevalence of these national designations. But while these were the names which the Sclavonians assumed on their own western boundary-lines, and by which they were known in foreign countries, they received the name of *Wends, Winiden,* O. H. G. *Winidâ,* A. S. *Veonodas,* from the Gothic tribes on whom they immediately abutted. By this name, or that of *Finns,* which is merely a different pronunciation, the Goths of the north designated their eastern neighbours, whether of Sclavonian or Turanian race. By this name the Saxons distinguished the Sclavonians in Lusatia. The traveller's song in the *Codex Exoniensis* expressly opposes the *Goths* to the *Wineds* wherever found; "I was," says the author (vv. 113, sqq.) "with Huns and with Hreth-Goths, with Swedes and with South-Danes, with Wends I was

and with Wærns, and with Wikings, with *Gefths* I was and with *Wineds.*" Although the strong but narrow stream of High-German conquest disturbed the continuous frontier of the Sclavonian and Low-German tribes, we find, as late as Charlemagne's time, that Sclavonians were recognized in central Germany under the designations of *Moinu-winidi* and *Ratanz-winidi*, from the names of the rivers which formed their geographical limits. The same denomination was applied in much earlier times to the Sclavonians settled in Bavaria, who were called the *Vinde-lici*, or *Wineds* settled on the *Licus* or *Lech*. Farther east on the Danube the March-field furnished another boundary to the Sclavonians, whose city there was called *Vind-o-bonum*. We must of course admit the same term in the name of the *Veneti* at the head of the Adriatic. And thus we trace this distinctive appellation from Scandinavia to the north of Italy, in a line nearly corresponding to the parallel of longitude. The ethnographic importance of the name *Wined* can scarcely be overrated: for it not only tells us that the tribes to the east of the line upon which it is found were generally pure Sclavonian, but it tells us as plainly that the tribes to the west, who imposed the name, were equally pure branches of the Gothic, Saxon, or Low-German race. Indeed, the latter fact is more certain than the former. For if, as I believe, the term *Wined* merely indicates, in the mouth of a Low-German, the *end* or *wend*-point of his distinctive territory, our inference must be that whatever the *Wineds* were, they indicated the boundary-line of some branch of the Gothic race. Now we have such a boundary line in Bavaria; therefore the *Rœtians* who faced the *Vindelici* or *Lech-Wineds* were Low-Germans. We have a similar line in the north of Italy; therefore there must have been Low-Germans in opposition and contiguity at the western frontier of the *Veneti* or *Wineds* on the Po. But we have seen that the Etruscans, properly so called, were *Rœtians*, who at one time occupied a continuous area stretching from western Germany across the Tyrol into the plains of Lombardy. It follows therefore, as an ethnographical fact, that the Etruscans must have been a Low-German, Gothic, or Saxon tribe.

§ 21. *Reasons for comparing the old Etruscan with the Old Norse.*

These combinations would be sufficient, if we had nothing else, to establish *primâ facie* the Gothic affinities of the old Etruscans. But they are only the first step in a cumulative argument, which, when complete, raises our conclusion to the rank of a philological demonstration. Some of the details must be reserved for the chapter on the Etruscan language; but the general effect of the reasoning shall be given here.

If the ancient Etruscans were Low-Germans, they must present the most striking marks of resemblance when they are compared with the oldest and least alloyed branches of that family. In the center of Europe the Low-German element was absorbed by the High-German, and the latter became a qualifying ingredient in all the Teutonic tribes of the mainland, who were not similarly affected by Sclavonism. As I have elsewhere suggested (*New Crat.* § 78), the Lithuanians were Low-Germans thoroughly Sclavonized; the Saxons or *Ingœvones* were Low-Germans untainted by Sclavonism, and but slightly influenced by High-Germanism; the Franks or *Iscœvones* were Low-Germans over whom the High-Germans had exercised considerable control; and the Thuringians or *Herminones* were pure High-Germans, in the full vigour of their active opposition to the tribes among which they had settled. For Low-German unaffected by any qualifying element we must go to the Scandinavian or *Norse* branch of the race, which contains the Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, Faroic, and Icelandic tribes. The oldest or standard form of the languages spoken by these tribes is the Old Norse or Icelandic, which not only exists as a spoken tongue, but is also found in a very flourishing and ancient literature. The present inhabitants of Iceland trace their descent from emigrants who settled there in the ninth century; and from circumstances connected with their isolated position the language has remained the unaltered representative of the oldest known form of Scandinavian or pure Gothic. It is therefore with this Old Norse or Icelandic, the language of the Sagas and Runes, that we must compare the old Etruscan, if we wish to approximate to the common mother of both, on the hypothesis that they are both traceable to the same stock. But the reader must from the first be guarded

against the ridiculous idea that I identify the Etruscan with the Icelandic. The proposition which I maintain is this: that the Icelandic in the uncultivated north represents in the ninth century of our æra the language of a race of men, who might have claimed a common pedigree with those Ræto-Etruscans of the south, who became partakers in the Pelasgian civilization about 1600 years before that epoch. Moreover the Icelandic or Old Norse remains pure to the last, whereas the Etruscan is from the first alloyed by an interpenetration of Umbrian and Pelasgian ingredients. Consequently, it will justify all our reasonable expectations, if we find clear traces of the Old Norse in the distinctive designations of the Etruscans, that is, in those names which they imported into Italy, and if we can make the Scandinavian languages directly available for the explanation of such of their words and phrases as are clearly alien from the other old idioms of Italy. This, and more than this, I shall be able to do.

§ 22. *Old Norse explanations of Etruscan proper names.*

It has been shown in the preceding chapter that the conquerors of the Umbrians and Tyrrheno-Pelasgians in Northern Italy called themselves *Ras-ena.* Niebuhr has suggested that this word contains the root *ras-* with the termination *-ena* found in *Pors-ena*, &c., and I have hinted that the same root is found in the distinctive designation of this race, *Et-rus-ci* or *Het-rus-ci*, which presumes an original *Het-rusi*, whence *Het-rur-ia* for *Het-rusia.* The old Norse will tell us the meaning both of the root and of the prefix: for in Icelandic *hetia* is "a warrior, hero, or soldier," and in the same language *ras* implies rapidity of motion, as *at rasa*, "to run." So that *Ras-ena* and *Het-rusi* imply a warrior-tribe, distinguished by their sudden onset and rapid career. Thus a warrior is πόδας ὠκύς, predaceous animals are θῶες, and the old Scandinavian pirates have left the eagle or the war-galley on the armorial bearings of those families which claim a descent from them, as an indication of the same characteristic. This would be admitted as a reasonable conjecture even if it had nothing else to recommend it. However, it does so happen that we have a distinct record of a migratory conquest by the Scandinavians in the heart of Europe rather before the colonization of Iceland, in which they called themselves by the same name as these *Rasena* or *Het-rus-i.* It has been

shown by Zeuss (*die Deutschen*, pp. 547, sqq.) that the language of these conquerors, who descended the Dnieper, the Volga, and the Don, was old Norse, and that their leader *Chacan* bears the Norse name *Hakon;* and Symeon Magister, who wrote A. D. 1140, has given the same Scandinavian explanation of their name *Ros*, which I have suggested for *Ras-ena;* for he says (*Scriptor. post Theophan.* ed Paris, p. 490): οἱ Ρῶς οἳ καὶ Δρομῖται λεγόμενοι, "the *Ros* who are called the racers or runners;" and (p. 465): Ῥῶς δὲ οἱ Δρομῖται φερώνυμοι—δρομῖται δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀξέως τρέχειν αὐτοῖς προσεγένετο, "the *Ros* are called the runners, and they are so called from the rapidity of their motion[1]." Here the conjecture, which I proposed to the British Association, is confirmed by an authority subsequently observed: and no one will deny the obvious value of this corroboration. It may therefore be laid down as a matter of fact that the distinctive ethnical designation of the old Etruscans is Scandinavian; and we shall see that their mythological or heroic names are explicable in the same way. Niebuhr remarked, without attaching any importance to the observation, that there was a singular resemblance between the Scandinavian mythology and that of the Etruscans: "according to their religion, as in that of the Scandinavians, a limit and end was fixed to the life even of the highest gods" (*H. R.* I. note 421). Now in the Scandinavian mythology there is no name more prominent than that of *Thor* or *Tor*, and this prefix is a certain indication of the presence of the Northmen in any country in which it is found. Hickes says: "Præp. *Thor* vel *Tor* in compositis denotat difficultatem, arduitatem, et quid efficiendi molestiam, pessumdans significationem vocis cui præponitur, ut in *Tor-œre* 'annonæ difficultas et caritas,' *Tor-færa*, 'iter difficile et impeditum,' *Tor-feiginn*, 'acquisitu difficilis,' *Tor-gœtu*, 'rarus nactu,' &c. Ex quibus constat, ut nomen deastri *Tyr* veterum septentrionalium

---

[1] Zeuss suggests that the original old Norse form was *Rœsar* from the sing. *Rœsir* = δρομίτης = *cursor*. He asks: "gehört hieher auch *Rœsir* in den Liedern haüfiges Synonymum für *Konúngr*, etwa der *Schnelle, Edle?*" and quotes Skaldskaparm. p. 191, for *Rœsir* as a man's name. The name *Ros* or *Rus*, as applied to the Scandinavians, is presumed in the designation *P-rusi* = *po-Rus-i* "adjoining the *Ros*:" cf. *Po-morani*, "the dwellers on the sea" (*po-more*).

Mercurii in compositione *gloriam, laudem,* et *excellentiam* denotet: sic nomen idoli *Thor* euphonice *Tor* eorum *Jovis* et *Herculis,* qui cum malleo suo omnia domuit et superavit, in compositione significat et insinuat *difficultatem* quasi *Herculeam* vel *rem adeo arduam et difficilem,* ut *Thori* opem posceret, qua superari quiret." The lexicographer has here confused between the name of the god *Thor* (Grimm, *D. M.* p. 146, et passim) and a prefix equivalent to the Sanscrit *dur-* Greek *δυσ-* (*N. Crat.* § 180). But whatever may be the true explanation of this initial syllable, there can be no doubt that it belongs to the oldest and most genuine forms of the Low-German languages; and when we find the name *Tar-chon* or *Tar-quin* among the mythical and local terms of the ancient Etruscans, we cannot but be struck by the old Norse character impressed upon them. We at once recognise the Scandinavian origin of the town of *Thor-igny* in the north-west of Normandy, where the termination is the same as that of many towns in the same district, as *Formigny, Juvigny,* &c., and corresponds to the Danish termination *-inge,* as *Bellinge, Helsinge,* &c. (Etienne Borring, *sur la limite méridionale de la Monarchie Danoise.* Paris, 1849, p. 9). It is worthy of remark that the word *ing-*, which is appropriated by the *Ing-ævones, Ang-li, Engl-lish,* and other Low-German tribes, seems to signify "a man" or "a warrior" (Grimm, *D. M.* I. p. 320), and as *quinna* is the Icelandic for *mulier, Tor-ing* and *Tar-quin* might be antithetical terms; and the latter would find a Low-German representative in *Tor-quil.* The other mythical name of the old Etruscans, which comes in close connexion with *Tar-quin,* is *Tana-quil;* and *Tar-quin* or *Tor-quil* and *Tana-quil* might represent a pair of deities worshipped at *Tarquinii,* the plural name of which indicates, like *Athenæ* and *Thebæ,* the union of two communities and two worships, the Pelasgian *Tina* or *Tana,* i. e. *Janus,* being placed on an equal footing with the Scandinavian *Thor.* This is inverted in the tradition which weds the Greek Demaratus to the indigenous *Tana-quil.* At any rate, we cannot but be struck with the Scandinavian sound of *Tana-quil,* which reminds us of *Tana-quisl,* the old Norse name of the Tanais, which, although the name of a river, is feminine (Grimm, *D. Gr.* III. p. 385).

These coincidences become the more striking, when we remember that we are comparing the old Norse, of which we know

nothing before the eighth century of our æra, with the old Etruscan, which flourished nearly as many centuries before the birth of Christ. And when we add to all these evidences of direct history, ethnography, and mythology, the fact, which will be exhibited in a subsequent Chapter, that the Scandinavian languages supply an immediate and consistent interpretation of those parts of the Etruscan inscriptions which are otherwise inexplicable, no reasonable man will refuse to admit that the linguistic and ethnological problem suggested by the old inhabitants of Etruria has at length received the only solution, which is in accordance with all the data, and in harmony with the nature and extent of the materials and with the other conditions of the case.

§ 23. *Contacts and contrasts of the Semitic and the Sclavonian.*

It appears that the original settlements of the Sclavonian race were in that part of Northern Media which immediately abuts on Assyria, and therefore on the cradle of the Semitic family[1]. From this we should expect that the Sclavonian dia-

[1] It can scarcely be necessary to point out the difference between the ethnological argument by which I have traced the Pelasgo-Sclavonians to an original settlement in the immediate vicinity of upper Mesopotamia, and Mrs. Hamilton Gray's conjectural derivation of the *Rasena* from *Resen* on the Tigris (*History of Etruria*, I. pp. 21, sqq.). To say nothing of the fact that I do not regard the *Rasena* as Pelasgian, I must observe that it is one thing to indicate a chain of ethnical affinities which extended itself link by link through many centuries, and another thing to assume a direct emigration from Resen to Egypt, and from Egypt to Etruria. The hypothesis of an Egyptian origin of the Etruscans is as old as the time of Bonarota, but we know enough of the Semitic languages to be perfectly aware that the Rasena did not come immediately from Assyria or Egypt. Besides, if this had been the case, they would have retained the name of their native Resen until they reached Italy. In tracking the High-Germans and Hellenes from Caramania to Greece and central Europe, we find in the dry-bed of history continuous indications of their starting-point and route (*New Cratylus*, § 92). And the *Sauro-matæ* preserve in all their settlements a name referring to their "Median home." But Mrs. Gray's *Rasena* forget their native *Resen* in the alluvial plains of Egypt, and miraculously recover this ethnographical recollection in Umbria and among the Apennines. This is not in accordance with observed facts. Wandering tribes call themselves by the name of their tutelary hero, or by

lects would furnish us with the point of transition from the Indo-Germanic to the Semitic languages; and an accurate examination of the question tends to show that this expectation is well founded. But etymological affinities may exist by the side of the greatest contrast in regard to the state or condition of two languages; and thus we find that, while the Semitic and Sclavonian come very close in etymology, they are unlike in syntactical development in those points which most distinguish the Sclavonian from other Indo-Germanic idioms. As I have elsewhere discussed this subject at sufficient length[1], I shall here only recapitulate the general results of the inquiry. (1) The salient points of resemblance between the etymological structure of the Semitic and Sclavonian languages are (*a*) a number of common words which are more or less peculiar to both: as טוֹב *dhôb*, דבר *debr*, "good," compared with the Russian *dob-ro*; דֶּרֶךְ *derek*, דרך *derej*, "a road," compared with the Russian *doroga*, גָּדוֹל *gâ-dôl*, "great," compared with the Russian *dolgie*, &c.; (*b*) a tendency to the agglutination of concrete structures in both. If roots were originally monosyllabic, the triliteral roots of the Semitic languages cannot be otherwise accounted for than by supposing that they are pollarded forms of words consisting of monosyllabic roots combined with a prefix, affix, or both. As then the Sclavonian languages exhibit words in this state of accretion, and as the Semitic petrefactions would most naturally emanate from this state, we must reckon this among the proofs of their etymological affinity; (*c*) the correspondences furnished by the comparative anatomy of the Semitic and Sclavonian verb.

---

some significant epithet applicable either to themselves or to their original country, and they keep this throughout their progress. There is no parallel to Mrs. Gray's assumed fact, that a body of men set forth from a great city, lost their name on the route, and resumed it in their ulterior settlements. On the whole, I must designate the conjecture about Resen as a lady-like surmise; very imaginative and poetical; but representing rather the conversational ingenuity of the drawing-room than the well-considered criticism of the library. On the contacts between the Semitic and Sclavonian tribes in their original settlements, the reader may consult the authorities quoted by Prichard, *Natural History of Man*, p. 142, and Mill, *Myth. Interpr. of Luke*, p. 66, note.

[1] *Report of the British Association for* 1851, pp. 146, sqq.

We find in both a parsimony of tense forms by the side of a lavish abundance of derived or conjugational forms; (*d*) the complete coincidence of the Semitic and Sclavonian languages in regard to their unimpaired development of the original sibilants; for it is only in these languages that we find the three sounds of *zain* and *zemlja*, of *tsade* and *tsi*, of *çamech* and *slovo:* and while the formation of palatals has proceeded to its full extent in Sclavonian and Arabic, the permanence of the pure sibilant in Hebrew is shown by the fact, that, with a full array of breathings, there is no diminution in the use of the sibilants in *anlaut* or as initials. (2) The most striking difference between the Semitic and Sclavonian languages—and it is one which marks the earliest of the former no less than the most modern representatives of the latter—consists in the fact, that while the Semitic languages are all in a syntactical condition, having lost most of their inflexions, and exhibiting all the machinery of definite articles, prepositional determinatives of the oblique cases, and other uses of particles to compensate defects of etymological structure, the Sclavonic languages have never arrived at this syntactical or logical distinctness, and have never abandoned their formative appendages and the other symptoms of etymological life and activity. These differences are due to the fact that while the Sclavonic tribes have remained pure up to the present time, and have been remarkable for their slow adoption of the art of writing and their inferior literary cultivation, the Semitic nations were from the earliest times exposed to the frequent intermixture of cognate races, and were the first possessors of an alphabet and of written records. We have therefore, in the antithesis or contrast of the Sclavonic and Semitic, a proof of the effects which external circumstances may produce on the state or condition of a language; and the resemblances, to which I have called attention, must be taken as an indication of the permanence of that affinity which results from the geographical contact and intermixture of two races at a very early period.

§ 24. *Predominant Sclavonism of the old Italian languages.*

As the result of the ethnological speculations of this Chapter has been to show that the Pelasgian or Sclavonian was one of the earliest and certainly the most permanently influential element

in the old languages of Italy, we should expect to find in these languages those characteristics of Sclavonism which evince the primitive contact and actual contrast of the Semitic and Sclavonian idioms. And this expectation is amply justified by the facts of the case. For while, on the one hand, we observe in the old Latin, Umbrian, and Oscan, verbal resemblances to the Semitic, which cannot be accidental, because they belong to some of the oldest forms in the respective languages; and while both the Semitic and the old Italian are remarkable, like the Sclavonian, for their superabundance of sibilants, we observe that in spite of the cultivation of Greek literature by the Romans, and in spite of the adoption of the Greek ritual by the Sclavonians, these languages have never attained to the use of a definite article, which is the key-stone of Greek syntax, and without which the Semitic languages could not construct a single sentence. The preponderance of the sibilants in the old Italian languages will be discussed in the next Chapter, and we shall see in the proper place that in *anlaut*, or as an initial, the *s* always appears in Latin where it is omitted altogether, or represented only by an aspirate in Greek. Of the coincidences between the pure Latin and genuine Semitic words, it will be sufficient to give a few examples out of many which might be adduced. (*a*) The verb *aveo* or *haveo* is at least as closely connected with אָהַב or אוה as with any Indo-Germanic synonym. (*b*) The words *sĕ-curis* and *să-gitta* have occasioned great difficulty to philologers. The former, according to Bopp, (*Vergl. Gr.* p. 1097) is a participial noun from *seco*, and *sec-ûris=se-cusis* must be compared with the Sanscrit forms in *-ushí*=Gr. *-νῖα*. This however is hardly more than a conjecture, for we have no other Latin noun to support the analogy. It is more probable that the initial syllable in both words is one of those prepositional affixes which we find in *σ-κέπαρνον* compared with *κόπτω*, *s-ponte* compared with *pondus*, &c., and then we shall be able to see the resemblance between *sĕ-curis* and the Hebrew גָּרַז, Lett. *granst* "to hack or gnaw," and between *sa-gitta* and the Hebrew חֵץ from חָצַץ, which again is not unconnected with קָטַל, and the Latin *cædo*. (*c*) It has been proposed to derive *mare*, Sclav. *more*, from the Sanscr. *maru*, "the waste" (*Zeitschr. f. Vergl. Sprf.* I. p. 33); but it appears much more reasonable to compare these words with the Hebrew מַיִם, in which case the affix *re* will be connected with a word

denoting "flowing:" cf. *teme* with *tema-runda* (above § 11). (*d*) The Hebrew בָּרַךְ gives us the root *reg-*, "to reach out," with the prepositional affix *ba*, from *abhi*, as fully as the Latin *p-recor*, *posco=p-roc-sco*, Sanscrit *p-rach-châmi*, &c. (*e*) It is only in the Pelasgian δολιχός, the Sclavonic *dolgye*, and the Latin *in-dulgeo*, that we find a complete reproduction of the Semitic גָּדוֹל. (*f*) As the impersonal use of *debeo* nearly accords with that of *oportet*, and as the latter is manifestly connected with *opus* (Döderlein, *Lat. Syn. u. Et.* V. 324), it may be after all more reasonable to connect *deb-eo* with the important root *dob*, "a suitable time" (Polish), *dob-ro*, "good" (Polish and Russian), which furnishes us with one of the most remarkable instances of a connexion between the Sclavonian and Semitic languages (cf. the Hebrew טוֹב *dhôb*, and the Arabic دبر, *debr*), than to fall back upon either of the favourite derivations from δεύεσθαι or *dehibeo*. The adjective *debilis* differs so entirely in meaning and application from the verb *debeo*, to which it is referred, that I cannot concede the identity of origin. As there is reason to believe that the termination *-bilis* is connected with the substantive verb *fio* (written *bo* in the agglutinate forms), a reference to the usage of *de-sum* and *de-fio* would best explain the origin and meaning of *de-bi-lis*. How the sense of "owing" or "obligation" borne by *deb-eo* is connected with that of "fitness," "goodness," and "propriety," may be seen at once by an examination of such idioms, as δίκαιός εἰμι τοῦτο ποιεῖν, "I am bound to do this," εἰ μὴ ἀδικῶ, "I ought," &c. (*g*) A comparison of *heri* and χθές enables us to see that the Latin *humus* and the Greek χαμαὶ must meet in the root of χθαμα-λός. This combined form is therefore the Pelasgo-Sclavonic original, and as such we recognise it in the *kethuma* of the Cervetri inscription. Now this again is a near approximation to the Hebrew אַדָמָה. (*h*) The Roman use of *regio*, *dirigo*, &c., in reference to road-making, is the best explanation of the obvious connexion between the Russian *doroga* and the Hebrew דֶּרֶךְ, in which the initial dental must be explained in the same way as that in δρῶ = βλέπω, ἀ-θρέω, &c., compared with ὀ-ράω and the Hebrew רָאָה (*Maskil le-Sopher*, p. 38): for we have in Greek τ-ρέχω and δ-ρᾰFω (δραπ-έτης) by the side of ὀ-ρέγω, and ἔ-ρχο-μαι. These examples might be extended to any limit: but they are sufficient to

show how permanently the stamp of a Sclavonian origin and consequent Semitic affinity was impressed even on the composite Latin language. And this will enhance the interest with which the philosophical ethnographer must always regard the desperate struggle for empire between the Romans, as the ultimate representatives of Pelasgian Italy, and that great Punic colony, which maintained a Semitic language and Semitic civilization on the south coast of the Mediterranean.

CHAPTER III.

THE UMBRIAN LANGUAGE AS EXHIBITED IN THE EUGUBINE TABLES.

§ 1. The Eugubine Tables. § 2. Peculiarities by which the old Italian alphabets were distinguished. § 3. The sibilants. § 4. Some remarks on the other letters. § 5. Umbrian grammatical forms. § 6. Selections from the Eugubine Tables, with explanations: Tab. I. a, 1. § 7. Tab. I. a, 2-6. § 8. Tab. I. b. 13, sqq. § 9. Extracts from the Litany in Tab. VI. a. § 10. Umbrian words which approximate to their Latin synonyms. § 11. The Todi inscription contains four words of the same class.

§ 1. *The Eugubine Tables.*

FROM the preceding investigations it appears that the original inhabitants of ancient Italy may be divided into three classes. It is not necessary to speak here of the Celts, who formed the substratum in all the insular and peninsular districts of Europe, or of the Greeks, who colonized part of the country; but confining our attention to the more important ingredients of the population, we find only three—Sclavonians, Lithuanians or Sclavonized Goths, and pure Goths or Low-Germans. To the first belonged the various ramifications of the Pelasgian race; to the second, the Umbrians, Oscans, and, the connecting link between them, the Sabines; to the third, the Etruscans or Rasena, as distinguished from the Tyrrhenians.

The next step will be to examine in detail some of the fragmentary remains of the languages spoken by these ancient tribes. The Umbrian claims the precedence, not only on account of the copiousness and importance of the relics of the language, but also because the Umbrians must be considered as the most important and original of all those ancient Italian tribes with whom the Pelasgians became intermixed either as conquerors or as vassals.

The Eugubine Tables, which contain a living specimen of the Umbrian language, were discovered in the year 1444 in a subterraneous chamber at *La Schieggia*, in the neighbourhood of the ancient city of *Iguvium* (now *Gubbio* or *Ugubio*), which lay at the foot of the Apennines, near the *via Flaminia* (Plin. *H. N.* XXIII. 49). On the mountain, which commanded the city, stood the temple of *Jupiter Apenninus;* and from its connexion with the

worship of this deity the city derived its name:—*Iguvium*, Umbr. *Iiovium*, i. e. *Iovium*, Δῖον, Διὸς πόλις. The Tables, which are seven in number, and are in perfect preservation, relate chiefly to matters of religion. From the change of *s* in those of the Tables which are written in the Etruscan or Umbrian character, into *r* in those which are engraved in Roman letters, Lepsius infers (*de Tabb. Eugub.* p. 86, sqq.) that the former were written not later than A.U.C. 400; for it appears that even in proper names the original *s* began to be changed into *r* about A.U.C. 400 (see Cic. *ad Famil.* IX. 21. comp. Liv. III. cap. 4, 8. Pompon. *in Digg.* I. 2, 2, § 36. Schneider, *Lat. Gr.* I. 1, p. 341, note); and it is reasonable to suppose that the same change took place at a still earlier period in common words. By a similar argument, derived chiefly from the insertion of *h* between two vowels in the *Tabulæ Latine scriptæ*, Lepsius infers (p. 93) that these were written about the middle of the sixth century A.U.C., *i. e.* at least two centuries after the *Tabulæ Umbrice scriptæ*. But here I think he is mistaken: for the etymology of the words shows that the longer forms must have been more ancient than their abbreviations. And, in general, it is not very consistent with scientific philology to speak of an arbitrary *distractio vocalium*, when we are surprised by the appearance of an elongated syllable.

§ 2. *Peculiarities by which the old Italian Alphabets were distinguished.*

Before, however, we turn our attention to these Tables and the forms of words which are found in them, it will be advisable to make a few remarks on the alphabet which was used in ancient Italy.

The general facts with regard to the adaptation of the Semitic alphabet to express the sounds of the Pelasgian language have been discussed elsewhere[1]. It has there been shown that the original sixteen characters of the Semitic syllabarium were the following twelve:—

---

[1] *N. Crat.* § 100.

Breathings.	Labials.	Palatals.	Dentals.	
א *'h*	ב *b*	ג *g*	ד *d*	Medials.
ה *h*	ו *w*	ח *'h*	ט *dh*	Aspirates.
ע *"h*	פ *p*	ק *q*	ת *t*	Tenues.

with the addition of the three liquids, ל, מ, נ, and the sibilant ס; and it has been proved that these sixteen were the first characters known to the Greeks. They were not, however, sufficient to express the sounds of the old languages of Italy even in the earliest form in which they present themselves to us. The Umbrian alphabet contains twenty letters; the Oscan as many; the Etruscan and the oldest Latin alphabets nineteen. In these Italian alphabets some of the original Semitic letters are omitted, while there is a great increase in the sibilants; for whereas the original sixteen characters furnish only the sibilants s and th, the old Italian alphabets exhibit not only these, but sh or x, z, r, and ṙ. Of these additional sibilants, x is the Hebrew *shin*, z is *tsade*, r represents *resh*, and ṙ is an approximation to the sound of *θ*. This preponderance of sibilants is, as we have seen, a peculiarity of Sclavonian or Pelasgic articulation.

§ 3. *The Sibilants.*

As these sibilants constitute the distinguishing feature in the old Italian languages, it will be useful to speak more particularly of them, before we turn to the other letters.

(*a*) The primary sibilant s, as used by the Umbrians and Oscans, does not appear to have differed, either in sound or form, from its representative in the Greek alphabet.

(*b*) The secondary sibilant z, in the Umbrian and Etruscan alphabets, appears to have corresponded to only one of the two values of the Greek ζ. The latter, as I have proved elsewhere, was not only the soft *g* or *j*, or ultimately the sound *sh*, but also, in its original use, equivalent to the combination *ds*, transposed in some dialects to *sd*, and ultimately assimilated to *ss*. Now the Romans expressed the first sound of the Greek ζ either by *di* or by *j*, and its ultimate articulation (*sh*) by *x*; whereas, on

the other hand, they represented ζ = δσ either by a simple *s*, or by its Greek assimilation *ss*. Thus the Etruscan *Kanzna*, *Venzi*, *Kazi*, *Veliza*, are written in Latin *Cæsius*, *Vensius*, *Cassius*, *Vilisa*, and Ζάκυνθος becomes *Saguntus;* while the Greek μάζα, μύζω, ὄβρυζον, πυτίζειν, ἀναγκάζειν, κωμάζειν, may be compared with *massa*, *musso*, *obrussa*, *pytissare*, *necesse*, *comissari*. In the Eugubine Tables, words, which in the Umbrian characters exhibit a z, give us a corresponding s in those which are written with Latin letters. Thus, for the proper name *Iapuzkum*, as it is written in Umbrian characters, we have in the Latin letters *Iabuske*, *Iabusker*, &c.

(*c*) The aspirated Umbrian sibilant ś, for which the Oscans wrote x, expressed the sound *sh* (Germ. *sch*, Fr. *ch*), which was the ultimate articulation of the other sound of the Greek ζ. We may compare it with the Sanscrit श (ç); and, like that Sanscrit sibilant and the Greek ζ, it often appears as a softened guttural. Thus we find *pruseśetu* for *prusekatu*, Lat. *pro-secato;* and the termination *-kla*, *-kle*, *-klu* (Lat. *-culum*), often appears as *-śla*, *-śle*, *-ślu*. As in our own and other languages the gutturals are softened before the vowels *e* and *i*, so in Umbrian the guttural *k* generally becomes ś before the same vowels. The sibilant ś occurs only in contact with vowels, liquids, and *h;* and the prefix *an-*, which drops the *n* before consonants, retains it before vowels and ś.

(*d*) The letter ʀ is always to be regarded as a secondary or derived character. In Umbrian it generally represents, at the end of a word, the original sibilant s. When the Eugubine Tables are written in Etruscan characters, we have such forms as, *veres treplanes*, *tutas Ikuvinas;* but in those which give us Latin letters, we read *verir treplanir*, *totar Ijovinar*. This change is particularly observable in the inflexions of the Latin passive verb; and the Latin language, in other forms, uses the letter ʀ in the same way as the Umbrian. In fact, the most striking characteristic of the Umbrian language is its continual employment of the secondary letters ʀ and ʜ, both of which are ultimately derived from sibilants, or stronger gutturals. The former is used in Umbrian, not only in the verb-forms, as in Latin, but also in the declensions, in the Latin forms of which it only occurs in the gen. plural. The letter ʜ is often interposed between vowels both in Umbrian and in Latin. Thus we have

in Umbrian the forms *stahito, pihatu,* for *stato, piato,* and *Naharcum* derived from *Nar;* and in Latin, *ahenus, prehendo, vehemens, cohors, mehe* (Quinctil. I. 5, 2), by the side of *aeneus, prendo, vemens* (compare *ve-cors, cle-mens*), *cors, me;* and even *Deheberis* for *Tiberis:* this, as has been mentioned above, has been referred to a later epoch both in Umbrian and Latin (see Lepsius, *de Tabb. Eug.* p. 92, and Schneid. *Lat. Gr.* I. 1, p. 118, not. 187). There can be no doubt, however, that the longer forms are the older. Thus *stahito* contains the *h* of *stehen,* and *pre-hendo* gives us the true root of *hand* and *hinthian; vehe-* exhibits the guttural *auslaut* of *weg,* and in the same way *me-he* revives a relationship with *mich.*

(*e*) The sibilant ŕ is peculiar to the Umbrians. In the Latin transcription it is often represented by the combination *rs.* Sometimes, however, it seems to stand for *si,* as in *festiŕa = vestisia;* and it also serves as the ultimate assibilation of a dental or guttural, for *teŕa = dersa* and *tesva = dersva* are connected with *deda* and *dextra.* Its real pronunciation was probably similar to that of *θ,* which last occurs only twice in the Eugubine Tables. The frequent substitution of *r* for *d* in Latin indicates a change to that letter through the softened dental *θ,* and we often find ŕ where we should expect a dental, as in *furenŕ = furent, kapiŕe = capide, aŕveitu = advehito,* &c. Although ŕ is sometimes represented by *rs,* we also occasionally find this letter followed by *s,* as in the words *esturstamu, meŕs,* which in the Latin character are written *eturstahmu, mers.*

§ 4. *Some remarks on the other letters.*

Of the other letters it will not be necessary to say much. The most remarkable is the Oscan vowel í, which in the inscriptions appears as a mutilated F; thus, ꟻ. The same figure was adopted by the emperor Claudius to express the middle sound between *i* and *u* with which the Romans pronounced such words as *virtus, vigere,* and *scribere.* In Oscan it appears to have been either a very light *i* (and so distinguished from the vowel I, which generally represents the long *i* of the Romans), or else a very short *u.* In the Oscan inscriptions *í* is of more frequent occurrence than *i.* Whenever these vowels come together, *i* always precedes. í is almost invariably used to form the diph-

thongs *úí*, *aí*, *eí*, answering to the Greek οι (ῳ), αι (ᾳ), and ει; and *i* very rarely appears before two consonants.

The Oscan letter U′ stands to U in the same relation as this í to the Oscan I. The former seems to be a sort of very light *o*, which is substituted for it in those inscriptions which are written in the Latin character; whereas the letter *u* seems to represent the long *o* of the Latins, as in *-um* (Gr. *-ων*) for *orum*, *líkí-tud* for *lice-to*, *kvaísstur* for *quæstor*, &c.

The Umbrians and Oscans distinguished between U and V. The latter was a consonant, and was probably pronounced like our *w*. It was written as a consonant after K; but the vowel *u* was preferred, as in Latin, after Q.

The letters L and B were of rare occurrence in the Umbrian language. The former never stands at the beginning of a word, the latter never at the end of one. In the Oscan language we meet with L more frequently.

As the Etruscan alphabet had no medials, those of the Eugubine Tables which are written in Etruscan characters substitute K for G, *e. g. Krapuvi* for *Grabove*. But the Oscan and Umbrian inscriptions when written in Latin characters distinguish between the tenuis and medial gutturals, according to the marks introduced by Sp. Carvilius, viz. C, G.

In the Oscan alphabet D is represented as an inverted R; and the affinity between these letters in the Latin language is well known.

The labial P, which never terminates a word in Latin, stands at the end of many mutilated forms both in Umbrian and Oscan, as in the Umbrian *vitlup* for *vitulibus* (*vitulis*), and the Oscan *nep* for *neque*. In general, it is to be remarked that the letters P, F, R, S, D, and T, all occur as terminations of Umbrian or Oscan words.

§ 5. *Umbrian Grammatical Forms.*

The grammatical forms of the Umbrian language are very instructive. In Umbrian we see the secondary letter *r*, that important element in the formation of Latin words, not only regularly used in the formation of the cases and numbers of nouns which in Latin retain their original *s*, but also appearing in plural verb-forms by the side of the primitive *s*, which is retained in the singular, though the Latin has substituted the *r* in both

numbers. The following are the three declensions of Umbrian nouns, according to the scheme given by Aufrecht and Kirchhoff (*Umbr. Sprachdenkm.* pp. 115, sqq.; see also Müller, *Götting. Gel. Anz.* 1838, p. 58):

I. Decl.	*Tuta*, a city.	II. Decl. *Puplus*, a people.
Sing. Nom.	*tuta, tutu.*	*puplus.*
Gen.	*tuta-s, tutar.*	*puple-s, pupler.*
Dat.	*tute.*	*puple.*
Accus.	*tutam.*	*puplu-m.*
Abl.	*tuta.*	*puplu.*
1. Locat.	*tutamem.*	*puplumem.*
2. Locat.	*tutemem.*	
3. Locat.	*tute.*	
Plur. Nom.	*tutas, tutar.*	*puplus.*
Gen.	*tutarum.*	*puplum.*
Dat. / Abl.	*tutes.*	*puples.*
Accus.	*tutaf.*	*pupluf.*
1. Locat.	*tutafem.*	*puplufem.*
2. Locat.	*tutere?*	*puplere?*

III. Decl.	*Ucri-s*, a mountain.	*Nume*, a name.
Sing. Nom.	*ucar.*	*numen.*
Gen.	*ucres.*	*numnes.*
Dat.	*ucre.*	*numne.*
Accus.	*ucrem.*	*numen.*
Abl.	*ucri.*	*numne.*
Locat.	*ucremem.*	*numenem?*
Plur. Nom.	*ucres.*	*numena?*
Gen.	*ucrium?*	*numenum?*
Dat. / Abl.	*ucres.*	*numnes?*
Accus.	*ucref.*	*numena?*
Locat.	*ucrefem?*	*numenem?*

The Umbrian pronouns are the demonstratives *eso*, or *ero*, and *esto*, corresponding to the Latin *is* and *iste*, and the relative or interrogative *poe*, corresponding to the labial element in *qui* and *quis*. The demonstratives are generally construed as adjectives; but, with the affix *-hunt* or *-k*, *ero* may become substantive.

Thus we have *er-ont*, or *ere-k*, as an indicative pronoun. The affix *-k* is that which plays so important a part in Latin. The affix *-hunt* or *-hont* (Goth. *hindana*, Etrusc. *hinthiu* or *hintha*) appears in the comparative and superlative adverbs *hunt-ra* or *hond-ra*, (Goth. *hindar*, O. N. *hindra*), and *hond-omu*, Goth. *hindumist*, signifying "farther," "lower," or "farthest," "lowest;" so that *hond* may correspond to our *yon* or *yonder:* and as *k* expresses proximity, *ere-k* and *er-ont* will gain the meaning of "here" and "there," from their terminations respectively; so that *esu-k*, *es-tu*, and *er-ont*, may have corresponded in distinctive meaning to the Latin *hic*, *iste*, *ille*, the first part being the same in each, and identical with the initial syllable of *is-te*.

The verbs generally occur in the imperative mood, as might be expected, since the Tables contain chiefly prayers and injunctions about praying. In these imperatives we mostly recognise a singular in *-tu*, and a plural in *-tutu;* as *fu-tu* (VI. a, 30, &c.), and *fu-tutu* (VI. b, 61), corresponding to *es-to*, *es-tote*. Verbs of the *-a* conjugation seem occasionally to make their imperative in *-a*, like the Latin. See I. b, 33: *pune purtinśus, kaŕetu; pufe apruf fakurent, puze erus teŕa; ape erus teŕust, pustru kupifiatu:* where, though the meaning of particular words may be doubtful, the construction is plain enough: *postquam porrexeris, calato; ubi apros fecerint, uti preces det; quando preces dederit, postero* (=*retro*) *conspicito*. We often have the perf. subj. both singular and plural, as may be seen in the example just quoted. The pres. subj. too occasionally appears, the person-ending in the singular being generally omitted, as in *arsie* for *arsies* = *ad-sies*, and *habia* for *habeas*. The Oscan infinitive in *um*, as *a-ferum* = *circum-ferre*, is also used in Umbrian; and we often find the auxiliary perfect both in the singular and in the plural. See VI. b, 30: *perse touer peskler vasetom est, pesetom est, peretum est, frosetom est, daetom est, touer peskler virseto avirseto vas est:* i. e. *quod tui sacrificii vacatum est, peccatum est, neglectum est, rejectum est, projectum est, tui sacrificii visa invisa vacatio est*[1]. And we have not only *skrehto*

[1] It seems that *vas* must be the root of *vas-etom*, and probably both refer to the evacuation or nullification of the sacrifice; cf. *vas-tus*, &c. with the Greek ἐκ-κενόω: *virseto avirseto* is compared with Cato's "ut tu morbos *visos invisosque* prohibessis" (*R. R.* 141).

est, but also *skreihtor sent* (VI. a, 15). The active participle seems to end both in *-ens*, like the Latin, and also in *-is*, like that of the Greek verbs in *-μι*. The following are the forms of *sum*, *fui*, and *habeo* which are found in the Tables.

Sum (root es). Fu-.

Pres. Indic. (A. I.)

3. sing. *est.*
3. plur. *sent.*

Pres. Subj. (A. III.)

2. sing. *sir, si, sei, sie.*
3. sing. *si.*
3. plur. *sins.* *fuia.*

Perf. Subj. (C. III.)

3. sing. *fuiest, fust.*
3. plur. *furent.*

Imper. (B. I.)

2, 3. sing. *futu.*
2. plur. *fututo.*

Infin. (D.)

eru or *erom*, (V. 26, 29, VII. b, 2.)

Habeo.

Pres. Indic. (A. I.)

3. sing. *habe*[*t*] (I. b, 18; VI. b, 54).

Pres. Subj. (C. I.)

2. sing. *habia*[*s*] (V. a, 17).

Perf. Subj. (C. III.)

2. sing. *habiest* (VI. b, 50); *habus* (*habueris*) (VI. b, 40).
3. plur. *haburent* (VII. a, 52).

Imperat. (B.)

2. sing. *habitu* (VI. a, 19); or *habetu* (II. a, 23).
2. plur. *habituto* (VI. b, 51); or *habetutu* (I. b, 15).

§ 6. *Selections from the Eugubine Tables, with explanations.*

In interpreting the remains of the Umbrian language, it seems advisable, in the present state of our knowledge, that we should confine our attention to those passages which fall within

the reach of a scientific philological examination. Grotefend[1], indeed, has frankly and boldly presented us with a Latin version of all the Eugubine Tables; but although he has here and there fallen upon some happy conjectures, his performance is for the most part mere guesswork of the vaguest kind, and therefore, for all purposes of scholarship, uninstructive and unsatisfactory. Lassen, by attempting less, has really effected more[2]. There is, however, no one who has done more to prepare the way for a scientific examination of these Umbrian documents than Lepsius, who examined all the preliminary questions connected with the subject in an inaugural dissertation published in 1833,[3] and who has subsequently edited a most accurate collection of facsimiles, which appeared in 1841.[4] The materials furnished by Lepsius have been elaborately discussed in a special work by Aufrecht and Kirchhoff, published in 1849;[5] and though this treatise is defective in arrangement and inconvenient for purposes of reference, it deserves the praise of never attempting too much, and it is generally distinguished by a careful regard for the principles of sound philology.

The following extracts are selected from the admirable transcripts of Lepsius[6], and the arrangement of the Tables is that which he has adopted. The first four Tables, and part of

---

[1] *Rudimenta Linguæ Umbricæ*, Particulæ VIII. Hannov. 1835-1839.

[2] *Beiträge zur Deutung der Eugubinischen Tafeln*, in the *Rhein. Mus.* for 1833, 4. Of earlier interpretations it is scarcely necessary to speak. It may, however, amuse the reader to know that the recent attempt of a worthy herald, in the sister-island, to prove that Irish of a certain kind was spoken by the ancient Umbrians and Tuscans, has its parallel in a book published at Ypres in 1614, by Adriaen Schrieck, who finds the ancient language of his own country in the seventh Eugubine Table! (*Van 't Beghin der eerster Volcken van Europen*, t'Ypre, 1614). The Irish book, however, is the more elaborately ridiculous of the two. It has been exposed, with considerable ability and humour, in the *Quarterly Review*, Vol. LXXVI. pp. 45, sqq.

[3] *De Tabulis Eugubinis*. Berolini, 1833.

[4] *Inscriptiones Umbricæ et Oscæ*. Lips. 1841.

[5] *Die Umbrischen Sprachdenkmäler: ein Versuch zur Deutung derselben*. Berlin, 1849.

[6] In citing the edition of Lepsius as now constituting the standard text, we must not forget the excellence of Bonarota's transcriptions, to which Lepsius himself has borne testimony. *De Tabb. Eug.* p. 14.

the fifth, are written in the Etruscan or Umbrian character. The others are in Latin letters.

Tab. I. a, 1. This Table and its reverse contain the rules for twelve sacrifices to be performed by the *Fratres Atiersii* in honour of the twelve gods. The same rules are given in Tables VI. and VII. and in nearly the same words, the differences being merely dialectical; but the latter Tables add the liturgy to be used on the occasion, and also dwell at greater length on the auguries to be employed, &c. The first Table begins as follows:

Este persklum aves anzeriates enetu, 2. pernaies pusnaes.

And in VI. a, 11, we have:

Este persklo aveis aseriater enetu.

There can be little doubt as to the meaning of these words. *Este*, which is of constant recurrence in the Tables, is the Umbrian adverb corresponding to *ita*, which is only a weaker form of it. If we may infer that *persklum* or *persklo=preç-culum*, we may render this word "a prayer." Grotefend derives the noun from *purgo*, and translates it by "*lustrum*." But *pur-go* is a compound of *purus* and *ago* (comp. *castigo*, &c.), whereas the root *pers-*, signifying "pray," is of constant occurrence in Umbrian; and every one, however slightly conversant with etymology, understands the metathesis in a case of this kind. It is the same root as *prec-* or *proc-* in Lat., *pereç-* in Zend, *prach'-* in Sanscr., *frag-en* or *forsch-en* in Germ., &c.

It is clear that *aves anzeriates* or *aveis aseriater* are ablatives absolute. As we have *avif seritu* or *aseriatu* (VI. b, 48, 49. I. b, 11, &c.) by the side of *salvam seritu* (VI. a, 51, &c.), and as this last is manifestly *salvam servato*, it is pretty clear that *aves anzeriates* must be equivalent to *avibus observatis* (= *in-servatis*).

Enetu is clearly the imperative of *ineo*, for *in-ito;* the preposition had the form *en = in* in old Latin; thus we find in the *Columna Rostrata: enque eodem macistratod:* and the same was the case in Oscan, which gives us *em-bratur* for *im-perator*.

The adjectives *per-naies, pus-naes*, are derived from *per-ne, post-ne*, which are locative forms of the prepositions *præ* and *post*, and signify "at the southern and northern side of the temple." The birds are so defined with reference to the practice

of the augurs in such cases. See Varro, *L. L.* VII. § 7, p. 119, Müller: "*quocirca* cœlum, qua attuimur, dictum *templum*.... Ejus *templi* partes iv. dicuntur, *sinistra* ab oriente, *dextra* ab occasu, *antica* ad meridiem, *postica* ad septentrionem."

The meaning of the whole passage will therefore be: *Ita litationem avibus observatis inito anticis, posticis;* i.e. "Thus enter upon the supplication, the birds having been observed, those in the south, as well as those in the north."

§ 7. *Tab. I. a*, 2—6.

Tab. I. a, 2.

Pre-veres treplanes, 3. *Iuve Krapuvi tre*[*f*] *buf fetu, arvia ustentu*, 4. *vatuva ferine feitu, heris vinu, heri*[*s*] *puni*, 5. *ukriper Fisiu, tutaper Ikuvina, feitu sevum*, 6. *kutef pesnimu; arepes arves.*—Comp. VI. a, 22. *Pre-vereir treblaneir Iuue Grabovei buf treif fetu.* VI. b, 1. *Arvio fetu, uatuo ferine fetu, poni fetu*, 3. *okriper Fisiu, totaper Iiovina.*

The words *pre-veres* (*vereir*) *treplanes* (*treblaneir*) are easily explained in connexion with (7) *pus-veres treplanes*, (11) *pre-veres tesenakes*, (14) *pus-veres tesenakes*, (20) *pre-veres vehiies*, (24) *pus-veres vehiies*. It is obvious that these passages begin with the prepositions *pre*, "before," and *pus* = *post*, "behind," and that they fix a locality. The prepositions *per*, signifying "for," and *co* or *ku*, signifying "with" or "at," are placed after the word which they govern: thus we have *tuta-per Ikuvina* = "*pro urbe Iguvina*," *vocu-com Ioviu* = "*cum*" or "*in foco Jovio*." But the prepositions *pre* and *pus* precede, and it seems that they both govern the ablative, contrary to the Latin usage, which places an accus. after *ante* and *post*. The word *veres* (*vereir*) is the abl. plur. of a noun *verus* (cf. I. b, 9), corresponding in root and signification to the Latin *fores*. Compare also *porta* with the German *Pforte*. The *v* answers to the *f*, as *vocus, vas*, &c. for *focus, fas*, &c. Lassen (*Rhein. Mus.* 1833, pp. 380, sqq.) refers *treplanes, tesenakes, vehiies*, to the numerals *tres, decem*, and *viginti*. Grotefend, more probably, understands the adjectives as describing the carriages

used at the particular feasts. Cato (*R. R.* c. 135) mentions the *trebla* as a rustic carriage. *Tensa* is the well-known name of the sumptuous processional chariot in which the images of the gods were carried to the *pulvinar* at the *ludi Circenses* (Festus, p. 364, Müller)[1]; and *veia* was the Oscan synonym for *plaustrum* (Festus, p. 368, Müller). It is, therefore, not unreasonable to suppose, that the *fores treblanæ* furnished an entrance to the *Ocris* or citadel for *treblæ;* that through the *fores tesenakes* the statues of the gods were conveyed to their *pulvinar* in *tensæ;* and that the *fores vehiæ* allowed the larger chariots to enter in triumphal or festive procession. In the Latin Table the adj. derived from *tesna* or *tensa* ends in *-ox, -ocis,* like *velox;* in the Umbrian it ends in *-ax, -acis,* like *capax.* Aufrecht and Kirchhoff, to whom the true explanation of *verus* is due, suppose a quadrangular citadel with one side closed, and the other three opening with gates called by the names of the cities to which they led. But this mode of designation is not borne out by the names of the three gates, if there were only three, in the *Roma Quadrata* on the Palatine. These gates were called the *Porta Romanula, Janualis,* and *Mucionis,* and lay to the W., N.W., and N. (Müller, *Etrusk.* II. p. 147). Whatever the names meant, it is clear that they are not designations of towns to which the gates led. As there were no cities called *Trebla* and *Tesena,* and as *Veii* was too far off to give a name to one of the gates of *Iguvium,* it is much more reasonable to suppose that the entrances refer to the names of carriages with which they are so easily identified. To say nothing of the analogy of the French *porte cochère,* which actually denotes *une porte assez grande pour donner entrée aux coches ou voitures,* it is well known that the ancients measured road-ways by the kind of carriages which traversed them, or by the number of such carriages which could pass abreast. Thus we have ὁδὸς ἁμαξιτὸς for a wide road (Pind. *N.* VI. 56); ἁμαξιτὸς alone is used in the same sense (id. *P.* IV. 247); and Thucydides defines the breadth of a wall by saying that: δύο ἅμαξαι ἐναντίαι ἀλλήλαις τοὺς λίθους ἐπῆγον (I. 93).

---

[1] For the metathesis *tesna* or *tesena* for *tensa* we may compare *mesene flusare* in an inscription found near Amiternum (Leps. Tab. XXVII. 46 with *mense flusare* in the Latin inscription quoted by Muratori (p. 587).

The epithet *Krapuvius*, or in the Latin Table *Gra-bovius*, according to Lassen signifies "nourisher or feeder of cattle." The first syllable, he supposes, contains the root *gra-*, implying growth and nourishment, and found in the Sanscr. *grâ-ma* (signifying either "a herd of feeding cattle"—*grex*—or *vicus inter pascua*), in the Lat. *grâ-men*, in the Goth. *gras*, and in the Old Norse *groa* = *virescere*. Lassen, too, suggests that *Gradivus* contains the same root. This comparison ought perhaps to have led him to the true explanation of both words. For it is manifest that *Gra-divus* = *gravis* or *grandis Divus*; and it is equally certain that no genuine Latin compound begins with a verbal root. If, therefore, *Gra-bovius* contains the root of *bos, bovis*, the first syllable must be the element of the adjective *gravis* or *grandis*; so that *Grabovius* will be a compound of the same kind as καλλιπάρθενος (see Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 372). Pott, however, (*Et. Forsch.* II. p. 201) considers *Grab-ovius* as another form of *Gravi-Jovius*.

Tre or *treif buf* is either *boves tres* or *bobus tribus*. If we have here the accus. plural, we must conclude that this case in the Umbrian language ends in *-af, -of, -uf, -ef, -if, -eif*, according to the stem; and the labial termination has been compared with the Sanscrit and Zend change of *s* into *u* at the end of a word (Wilkins, § 51. Bopp, § 76). This is the opinion of Lassen (*Rhein. Mus.* 1833, p. 377). According to Lepsius and Grotefend, on the other hand, all these words are ablatives, because the termination is more easily explained on this hypothesis, and because verbs signifying "to sacrifice" are construed with the ablative in good Latin (Virg. *Eclog.* III. 77. Hor. *Carm.* I. 4, 11). The latter reason is confuted by the tables themselves; for it is quite clear that *abrons* is an accusative, like the Gothic *vulfans*, and yet we have both *abrons fakurent* (VII. a, 43) and *abrof fetu* (VII. a, 3). See also Pott, *Et. Forsch.* II. p. 202. With regard to the form, it is not explained by the Sanscrit analogies cited by Lassen, for these spring from the *visargâh* after *a*, as in *Ramah, Ramau, Ramô*. There is a much simpler way of bringing *abrof* and *abrons* into harmony. For the plural is formed from the singular by adding *s* to the latter. If then the accusative singular assumed the form *n* from *m*, this would be retained before *s*, as in *abron-s*; but if *abrom-s* passed by *visargâh* into *abrom-h*, this, according to the Celtic articulation, would

regularly become *abrof;* for in Celtic *mh* and *bh* are regularly changed into *v=f.* And we have seen above (p. 63) very good reasons for recognising Celtic influences in Umbria.

Feitu (*fetu*) is simply *facito,* the guttural being softened down, as in *ditu* for *dicito* (VI. b, 10, &c.)[1].

Arvia seems to be the same as the Latin *arvina,* i. e. "the hard fat which lies between the skin and the flesh" (Servius *ad Virg. Æn.* VII. 627); and *ustentu* is probably *obstineto,* which was the old Latin for *ostendito* (Festus, p. 197, Müll.).

Vatuva ferine feitu must mean "offer up unsalted meal" (*fatuam farinam* or *fatuâ farinâ*), according to Nonius Marcellus, IV. 291 (quoting Varro, *de Vit. Pop. Rom.* Lib. I.): *quod calend. Jun. et publice et privatim fatuam pultem diis mactat.* Grotefend supposes that *ferine* must mean raw flesh, and not *farina,* because "bread" (*puni*) is mentioned in the passage. But in minute directions like these, a difference would be marked between the meal (ἄλευρα) and the bread (ἄρτος); just as the hard fat (*arvina*) is distinguished from the soft fat (*adipes*), if the interpretation suggested below is to be admitted.

Heris vinu, heris puni, "either with bread or wine." *Heris,* as a particle of choice, is derived from the Sanscr. root *hri,* "to take;" Lat. *hir,* "a hand," &c.; and may be compared with *vel,* which is connected with the root of *volo,* as this is with the root of αἱρέω. In fact, *heris* appears to be the participle of the verb, of which the imperative is *heritu* (VI. a, 27, &c.). This verb occurs in the Oscan also (*Tab. Bantin.* 12, &c.).

That *ocriper* (*ucriper*) *Fisiu* means "for the Fisian mount" may be demonstrated from Festus, p. 181, Müller: "Ocrem antiqui, ut Ateius philologus in libro Glossematorum refert, montem confragosum vocabant, ut aput Livium: *Sed qui sunt hi, qui ascendunt altum ocrim?* et: *celsosque ocris, arvaque putria et mare magnum.* et: *namque Tœnari celsos ocris.* et: *haut ut quem Chiro in Pelio docuit ocri.* Unde fortasse etiam ocreæ sint dictæ inæqualiter tuberatæ." From this word are derived the names of some Umbrian towns, e. g. *Ocriculum* and *Interocrea* (cf. *Interamna*). The epithet *Fisius* indicates that the mountain was dedicated to the god *Fisius* or *Fisovius Sanšius* (*Fidius Sancus*), a name under which the old Italians

[1] According to Pott and Lepsius this imperative stands for *fito* = *fiat.*

worshipped Jupiter in their mountain-temples. Lassen (p. 388) refers to this temple the following lines of Claudian (*de VI. Cons. Honor.* 503, 4):

> Exsuperans delubra Iovis, saxoque minantes
> Apenninigenis cultas pastoribus aras.

He also quotes from the Peutinger inscription: "Jovis Penninus, idem Agubio," where *Iguvium* is obviously referred to. Lepsius thinks that *ocris Fisius* was the citadel of Iguvium.

Tota-per (*tuta-per*) *Ikuvina*, "for the city of Iguvium." It was always understood by previous interpreters that *tuta* or *tota* was nothing more than the fem. of the Lat. *totus*. But Lepsius has clearly proved that it is both an Oscan and an Umbrian substantive, signifying "city," from which the adj. *tuti-cus* is derived, as in the name of the magistrate *meddix tuticus*, i. e. *consul urbanus:* consequently *tuta-per Ikuvina* is simply "*pro urbe Iguvina.*" This substantive, *tota* or *tuta*, is, no doubt, derived from the adject. *totus;* for the idea of a *city* is that of "fulness," "collection," "entirety." Similarly, the Greek πόλις must contain the root πολ- (πολ-ύς) or πλε- (πλέος), signifying the aggregation of the inhabitants in one spot. The derivation of the adjective *tô-tus* is by no means easy; but if we compare it with *in-vî-tus* (from *vel-le*), we may be disposed to connect it with the root of the words *tel-lus, tol-lo, ter-ra, ter-minus* (τέλ-ος, τέρ-μα), &c.[1] *Op-pidum*, another name for "city," is only "a plain" (*ob-ped-um* = ἐπί-πεδον); and *oppido*, "entirely" = *in toto*, is synonymous with *plane*. The student will take care not to confuse between this *tô-tus* and the reduplicated form *tŏ-tus* (comp. *to-t-, quŏ-tus*, &c.), which is sufficiently distinguished from it in the line of Lucretius (VI. 652):

> Nec *tŏta* pars homo terraï *quŏta tôtius* unus.

Sevum and *kutef* are two adverbs. The former signifies "with reverence," and contains the root *sev-* (*sev-erus*) or σεβ- (σέβω)[2]. The latter is derived from *cav-eo, cautus*, with the affix *-f* = φι, and means "cautiously."

---

[1] According to Aufrecht and Kirchhoff, (p. 420) *tota* or *touta* is the passive participle of *tuv-* = *cresco*.

[2] According to Aufrecht and Kirchhoff, (p. 418) *sevum* is the same

The words *arepes arves* or *ariper arvis*, which conclude almost every prescription in the first Table, are not very easy. That Grotefend's translation *pro ardore* s. *ustione arvigæ* is inadmissible, every sound philologer must at once concede. The following suggests itself as the most probable solution. It appears that the Umbrian participle generally ended in *-es*, *-ez*, or *-eis*, like the old Greek participle of verbs in *-μι*. Thus we have *tases*, *tasis*, and *tasez*, for *tacens*. *Vesteis*, too, is obviously a participle (VI. a, 22). As, then, we constantly find the imperative *arveitu* for *advehito*, we may surmise that *arves*, *arvis*, is the participle for *advehens*; and *arepes*, *ariper*, on the same principle, will be *adipes*; so that the phrase will signify *adipes advehens* s. *porrigens*, i. e. "offering up the soft fat."

Accordingly, the translation of the whole passage should run thus: *Ante portam Treblanam Jovi Grabovio tres boves facito, arvinâ ostendito, fatuâ ferinâ facito, vel vino vel pane, pro monte Fisio, pro civitate Iguvinâ, facito severe, caute precator, adipes advehens*, i. e. "Before the gate, by which the *treblæ* enter, sacrifice three oxen to Jupiter Grabovius, offer up the hard fat, sacrifice with unsalted meal, either with wine or bread, for the Fisian mount, for the city of Iguvium, sacrifice reverently, pray cautiously, holding forth the soft fat of the victims."

§ 8. *Tab. I. b*, 13, *sqq.*

The next passage, which deserves notice and admits of a reasonable interpretation, is the following. Many of the intervening sentences, however, are so like that which has just been examined, that they can cause no real difficulty to the student. In I. b, 13, we have

enumek steplatu parfam tesvam tefe, Tute Ikuvine.

The first word is a particle of connexion signifying *inde*, *dein*, "then," "in the next place." It is also written *inumek*, and seems to be compounded of *inum* (the Lat. *enim*) and *ek*; compare the Gothic *inuhthis*, &c.

Steplatu, *stiplatu*, and *an-stiplatu*, are the imperatives of

---

adjective as that which furnishes the initial syllable to *sev-akni* = *sollennis* from *akno* = *annus*; and is therefore to be compared with the Latin *sollus* from *solvus*, Gr. ὅλFος, Sanscrit *sârva*.

a verb *stiplo* or *anstiplo*, which seems to be of proper application in matters of augury. In old Latin *stipulus* was synonymous with *stabilis* (Forcell. s. v. *stipulatio*): consequently this verb must signify something like *stabilio* or *firmo*, which last word is used in speaking of omens (Virgil. *Georg.* IV. 386).

Parfa, which occurs frequently in the Tables, is the augurial *parra*, a kind of owl, which the Italians in general call *civetta*, and the Venetians *parruzza;* and *tesva* means on the right: as will appear from the following considerations. At the beginning of the sixth Table we have, among the auspices, *parfa kurnase dersua, peiqu peica merstu;* which should seem to mean, *parram, cornicem, dextras; picum, picam sinistros.* The Roman augurs used to turn their faces to the south; consequently the east was on their left, and the west on their right. The east was in general the seat of good omens; but in certain cases, and with certain birds, the bad omen of the west, or right hand, might be converted into good. They made a distinction between the birds which gave the omen by their note, and those which gave the omen by their flight; the former were called *oscines*, the latter *alites*. The *parra* and the *picus* were reckoned in both classes, according to Festus (p. 197, Müller). Indeed there must have been some confusion among the augurs themselves, as Cicero seems to admit (*de Divin.* II. 39): "Haud ignoro, quæ bona sint, sinistra nos dicere, etiamsi dextra sint; sed certe nostri sinistrum nominaverunt, externique dextrum, quia plerumque melius id videbatur." Lutatius says, that the masculine gender indicates the propitious bird, and the feminine the unpropitious; yet the Umbrians seem to have held the *picus* and the *pica* in equal estimation. In constituting a good omen, the Umbrians placed the *picus* on the left, and the *cornix* on the right; while Plautus places them both on the left, but the *parra* on the right, as did the Umbrians (*Asin.* II. 1, 11):

> Impetritum, inauguratum 'st: quovis admittunt aves,
> Picus, cornix est ab læva; corvus, parra ab dextera.

Prudentius, though not an Umbrian like Plautus, preserves the Umbrian order (*Symmach.* II. 570):

> Cur Cremeræ in campis, cornice vel oscine parra,
> Nemo deûm monuit perituros Marte sinistra
> Ter centum Fabios, vix stirpe superstite in uno?

Comp. also Horat. III. *Carm.* XXVII. 1, &c.

Tesva in the Table means "the right," and may be compared with the Gothic *taíhsvô*. In the Latin Table it is written *dersua*, which is nearer to the Lat. *dextra*. That *merstus* must mean "propitious" or "salutary," is clear from the passages in which it occurs, as well as from the use of *mers*. A few lines lower we have (I. b, 18): *sve-pis habe purtatutu pue mers est, feitu uru pere mers est.* Comp. VI. b, 54: *so-pir habe esme pople portatu ulo pue mers est, fetu uru pirse mers est.* The meaning seems to be: *si quis habet portatum aliquid ubi salutare est, facito ustionem prout salutare est.* The etymology of *mers* is quite uncertain. Grotefend connects it with *medicus*, Lassen with *merx*. The passage before us will mean: *Inde stipulator parram dextram, tibi, civitati Iguvinæ*, i. e. "Thereupon make good the propitious owl for thee and the city of Iguvium."

§ 9. *Extracts from the Litany in Tab. VI. a.*

A complete examination of the whole of the Eugubine Tables does not fall within the limits of this work, and I will only add a few extracts from the Litany in the sixth Table.

VI. a: 22. *Teio subokau suboko*, 23. *Dei Grabovi, okri-per Fisiu, tota-per Iiovina, erer nomne-per, erar nomne-per; fos sei, paker sei, okre Fisei*, 24. *Tote Iiovine, erer nomne, erar nomne:*

i. e. *te invoco invocationem, Jupiter Grabovi, pro monte Fisio, pro urbe Iguvina, pro illius nomine, pro hujus nomine; bonus sis, propitius sis, monti Fisio, urbi Iguvinæ, illius nomini, hujus nomini.*

VI. a: 24. *Arsie, tio subokau suboko, Dei Grabove:*

i. e. *adsis, te invoco invocationem, J. Gr.*

In both these passages *sub-okau* is the verb for *sub-vocam*, and *sub-oco* is a noun, so that the construction is like Cato's: *te bonas preces precor* (*R. R.* 134, 139).

Arsier, frite tio subokau 25. *suboko D. Gr.*

Here *f-rite* is written for *rite*, just as we have *f-rango* by the side of *ῥήγνυμι*; *f-ragen, f-luo*, as well as *rogo, luo* (λούω);

f-ragum, ῥάξ; *f-renum*, "rein;" *f-rigere*, *rigere*, &c.; and in these tables probably *f-ri* for *rus*, *f-rosetom* for *rogatum*, &c.

VI. a: 26. *D. Gr., orer ose, persei okre Fisie pir orto est, toteme Iovine arsmor dersekor subator sent, pusei nep heritu.*

This passage is somewhat more difficult. It appears to me that the particles *per-sei*, *pu-sei*, mark the opposition of the *protasis* to the *apodosis*, "as"—"so," *prout—ita*. The chief difficulty here is in the word *arsmo-r*, which, however, occurs very frequently in the Tables. It is clearly the plural of *arsmo*. If we examine one of the numerous passages in which the word is found, we may be inclined to conjecture that it means a man or functionary of some sort. Thus in VI. a, 32, we have: *D. Gr. salvo seritu okrer Fisier, totar Iiovinar nome; nerf, arsmo, veiro, pequo, kastruo, fri, salva seritu;* which must surely mean: *J. Gr. salvum servato nomen ocris Fisii, urbis Iguvinæ, salvos servato principes* (i. e. *neriones*), *arsmos, viros, pecua, prædia, segetes*. Now Lassen has shown (*Rhein. Mus.* 1834, p. 151) that *dersecor* must be a derivative from *disseco*, and that, like *mergus, vivus*, from *mergere, vivere*, it must have an active signification. We have the verb *der-seco* = *dis-seco* in the form *dersikust, dersikurent* (*dis-secassit, dis-secaverint*). Consequently, *arsmor dersecor* must mean *arsmi dissecantes*, or *dissicentes* (for *dissico*, 4. conj., see Gronov. *Lect. Plautin.* p. 87). *Subator sent* is either *subacti sunt* or *subjecti sunt*, i. e. *submissi sunt*. On the whole, it is most probable that *arsmus* means a priest; and the following seems to be the true analysis of the word. If we compare *al-mus*, "the nourisher," with *alu-mnus*, "the nourished," and other forms in *-mnus* (*New Crat.* § 410), we may conclude that *ars-mus* has an active signification in reference to its first syllable. Now we have the root *ars-* in the Etruscan *hărus-pex*, and probably in *âra* = *âsa* = *ars-a*. And whatever is the meaning of the root of these two words, it is clear that it is not inconsistent with that which we should expect in *ars-mus*. Accordingly, it is a reasonable conjecture that *ars-mus* = *harus-mus* means a sacrificial priest, or altar-man. If this supposition be correct, we shall have no great difficulty in translating the passage before us. *Pir* occurs so often in connexion with *vuku* = *focus*, *asa* = *ara*, *uretu* = *urito*,

&c. that it must mean "fire," cf. Gr. πῦρ, O. H. G. *fiur*, N. H. G. *feuer*, O. N. *fyr*, Engl. *fire*. *Orer* is a deponent form of *oro*, after the analogy of *precor*, εὔχομαι. *Ose* is probably *ore*. *Nep* stands for *nec*, as in Oscan, but does not imply any disjunction: nor did *nec* or *neg* in old Latin; compare *nec-lego*, *nec-quidquam*, &c., and see Festus, p. 162, sub vv. *neclegens* and *nec*. Müller (*Suppl. Annot.* p. 387) supposes that the disjunctive *nec* or *neque*, and the negative *nec* or *neg*, were two distinct particles. To me it appears that *nec* or *neg* is never used for *non* except either as qualifying a single word—*neg-ligo*[1], *nec-opinans*, *neg-otium*,—in a conditional clause, as in the passages quoted by Festus, and Cato *R. R.* 141,—or in a prohibition, as here; in all which cases the Greeks used μή and not οὐ, and the Romans generally *ne* and not *non*. *Nego* is a peculiar case; the Greeks said οὔ φημι οὕτως ἔχειν for φημὶ μὴ οὕτως ἔχειν: and the same principle may be applied to explain οὐχ ἥκιστα, οὐ γὰρ ἄμεινον, &c. In a case like this the Romans seem to have used *nec* as qualifying and converting the whole word, in preference to *non*. Müller supposes that *negritu*, quoted by Festus (p. 165) as signifying *ægritudo* in augurial language, stands for *nec-ritu*. I think it must be a corruption for *ne-gritu*[*do*]: see below, Ch. VII. § 5. *Heritu* is the imper. of *hri*, "to take away," Sanscrit *hrĭ* = *capere*, *tollere*, *demere*, *auferre*, *rapere*, *abripere*, Welsh *hwra*. The whole passage then may be rendered: *J. Gr. precor precatione, quoniam in ocri Fisio ignis ortus est, in urbe Iguvina sacerdotes dissecantes submissi sunt,—ita ne tu adimas.*

---

[1] Prof. Newman (*Regal Rome*, p. 26) says that *neg-ligo* is to be compared with *nach-lassen*, and exhibits the German *nach* "after"—a particle unknown to Latin. I believe he is not responsible for this puerile derivation, which evinces a complete ignorance of the part which *nec* or *neg* plays in Latin words, and of the connexion of this particle with *nach*. We shall see when we come to the Etruscan language that *nak* occurs in an inscription with the sense "in" or "down in;" and in this or a similar sense *na* or *nach* is used in all the Sclavonian and German dialects—to say nothing of *po-ne*, *si-ne*, &c. in Latin. The guttural at the end of οὐ-**F**, οὐ-χί, does not differ from that in *ne-c*, *ne-que*; and as the Sanscrit *ava-k*, which is obviously connected with the Greek οὐ-κ = να-**F**α-κ (*New Crat.* § 189) signifies *deorsum*, we can easily reconcile the different significations of these particles.

§ 10. *Umbrian words which approximate to their Latin synonyms.*

This may suffice as far as the direct interpretation of the Tables is concerned. In conclusion, it may be well to give a list of those words in the Umbrian language which approach most closely to their Latin equivalents. And first, with respect to the numerals, which are the least mutable elements in every language, it is clear that *tuves* (*duves*), *tuva* (*duva*), and *tris*, *treia*, correspond to *duo* and *tres*, *tria*. Similarly *tupler* (*dupler*) and *tripler* represent *duplus* and *triplus*, and *tuplak* (III. 14) is *duplice*. It is obvious, too, that *petur* is "four," as in Oscan; see VI. b, 10: *du-pursus*, *petur-pursus*, i. e. *bifariam*, *quadrifariam*. As to the ordinals, *prumum* is *primum*, *etre* (*etrama*) is *alter*, and *tertie* (*tertiama*) is *tertius*.

The other words may be given in alphabetical order:

Abrof (*apruf*) (VII. a, 3) = *apros*.
Ager (Tab. XXVII. 21).
Ahes-no (III. 8, 19) = *ahenus*.
Alfu (I. b, 29) = *albus* (ἀλφός).
Amb-, prefix.
Ander (*anter*) (VI. b, 47. I. b, 8) = *inter* (sim. in Oscan).
Angla or *ankla* (VI. a, 1) = *aquila* (comp. *anguis* with ἔχις, *unda* with ὕδωρ, &c., see *New Crat.*, p. 303).
Anglome (VI. a, 9) = *angulus*.
An-tentu (passim) = *in-tendito*.
Ar-fertur (VI. a, 3) = *affertor*.
Arputrati (V. a, 12) = *arbitratu*.
Ar-veitu (I. b, 6) = *advehito* (cf. *arvis* and *arves*).
Asa (VI. a, 9, et passim) = *ara*.
Asiane (I. a, 25) = *Asiano*.
Atru (I. b, 29) = *ater*.
Aveis (VI. a, 1) = *avibus*, &c.
Benes (I. b, 50) = *venies*.
Bue (VI. a, 26, et passim) = *bove*.
Çesna (V. b, 9) = *cœna*.
Der-sikurent (VI. b, 62) = *dissecaverint*.
Der or *ter*, later *ders* or *dirs*, from *deda*, a reduplicated form of *da* = *dare*. It is sometimes found under the forms *duve* or *tuve*, especially in composition with *pur*, as in *pur-tuvi-tu* = *pro-dito* or *por-ricito* (II. a, 24).
Dekuria or *tekuria* (II. b, 1) = *decuria*, i. e. *decu-viria*.
Destru or *testru* (I. a, 29) = *dexter*.
Diçe or *tiçe* (II. a, 17) = *decere*.
Ditu (VI. b, 10) = *dicito*.
Du (VI. b, 50) = *duo*.
Dupla (VI. b, 18), so also *numer tupler* (V. a, 19)—comp. *numer prever* (V. a, 18) and *numer tripler* (V. a, 21).
Erom (VII. b, 2) = *eum*.
Etu (VI. b, 48) = *ito*.
Fakust (IV. 31) = *fecerit*.
Famerias Pumperias (VIII. a, 2) = *familiæ Pompiliæ*.

Far (V. b, 10) = *far*.
Fato (VI. b, 11) = *fatum*.
Feraklu (Müller, *Etrusk*. I. p. 57, note) = *ferculum*.
Fe'rehtru (III. 16) = *feretrum*.
Ferine (I. a, 4) = *farina*.
Fertu (VI. b, 50) = *ferto*.
Frater (V. b, 11).
Fos (VI. a, 23) = *bonus*.
Funtlere (I. b, 24) = *fontulo*.
Habetu (II. a, 23) = *habeto*.
Here = *velle*, connected with *hir*, "the hand," *pre*-HEND-*o*, αἱρέω, &c. (*New Crat*. § 162); hence *heri* = *vel* (I. a, 22); also in the sense of taking away, &c. like the Sanscr. *hṛi*, Welsh *hwra* (above p. 98).
Homonus (V. b, 10) = *homines*.
Ife (II. b, 12) = *ibi*.
Jvenka (I. b, 40) = *juvenca*.
Kanetu (IV. 29) = *canito*.
Kapi'e (I. a, 29) = *capide*, "with a sacrificial jug."
Kaprum (II. a, 1).
Ka'retu (I. b, 33) = *calato*.
Karne (II. a, 1).
Kastruo (VI. a, 30, et passim) = *castra*.
Katlo (II. a, 38) = *catulus*.
Komohota (VI. a, 54) = *commota*.
Kuratu (V. a, 24): *sve rehte kuratu si* = *si recte curatum sit*.
Kurnak (VI. a, 2) = *cornix*.
Kvestur (V. a, 23) = *quæstor*.
Maletu (II. a, 18) = *molito*.
Manu (II. a, 32) = *manus*.
Mehe (VI. a, 5) = *mihi*.
Mestru (V. a, 24) = *magister* v. *major*.
Mugatu (VI. a, 6) = *mugito*.
Muneklu (V. a, 17) = *munusculum*.
Muta (V. b, 2) = *multa*.
Naratu (II. a, 8) = *narrato* (Varro wrote *narare*).
Ner (VI. a, 30, &c.) = *princeps*.
Nome (passim) = *nomen*.
No-sve (VI. b, 54) = *nisi*.
Numer (V. a, 17) = *numerus*.
Numo (V. a, 17) = *numus*.
Orer (VI. a, 26) = *oro*, εὔχομαι.
Orto (VI. a, 26) = *ortus*.
Ose (VI. a, 26) = *ore*.
Ostendu (VI. a, 20) = *ostendo*.
Oui (VI. b, 43), *uve* (II. 6, 10) = *ovis*.
Pase (VI. a, 30) = *pace*.
Pater (II. a, 24).
Peiko (VI. a, 3) = *picus*.
Peku (VI. a, 30) = *pecus*.
Pelsana (I. a, 26) = *balsamon*.
Persnimu (I. b, 7) = *precator*.
Pihakler (V. a, 8) = *piaculum*.
Pihatu (VI. a, 9) = *piato*.
Pir (I. b, 12) = πῦρ, *fire*.
Plenasio (V. a, 2) = *plenarius*.
Poplo (passim) = *populus*.
Porka (VII. a, 6) = *porca*.
Post; postro (VI. b, 5) = *postero*, i. e. *retro*.
Prokanurent (VI. a, 16) = *procinerint*.
Proseseto (VI. a, 56) = *prosecato*.
Puemune (III. 26) = *pomona*.
Pupri'ke (III. 27) = *publice*.
Pur-tin-sus (I. b, 33) = *pro-tenderis*.
Pustertiu (I. b, 40) = *post-tertio*.
Rehte (V. a, 24) = *recte*.
Ri (V. a, 6) = *res*.
Ruphra (I. b, 27) = *rubra*.
Sakra (I. b, 29).
Salvo, salva, &c. (passim).
Seritu (passim) = *servato* (Müller, *Etrusk*, I. p. 55).
Sif (I. a, 7) = *sues*.

Skrehto (VII. b, 3) = *scriptus.*
Sopo (VI. b, 5) = *sapone.*
Stahitu (VI. b, 56) = *stato.*
Struśla (VI. a, 59) = *stru-cula*, dimin. of *strues.*
Subator (VI. a, 27, &c.) = *subacti.*
Suboko (VI. a, 22, &c.) = *sub-voco.*
Subra (V. a, 20) = *supra.*
Sve (V. a, 24) = Osc. *suæ*, Lat. *si.*
Śeritu (II. b, 24), vide *seritu.*
Śesna (V. b, 9) = *cesna, cœna.*
Tafle (II. a, 12) = *tabula.*
Tases (VI. a, 55) = *tacens.*
Tekuries (II. a, 1) = *decuriæ.*
Termnu-ko (VI. b, 53) = *cum termino.*
Tio (passim) = *te.*
Uŕetu (III. 12) = *urito.*
Urnasier (V. a, 2) = *urnarius.*
Uvikum (III. 28) = *cum ove.*
Vas (VI. a, 28) = *vas-tus.*
Vatuva (I. a, 4) = *fatua.*
Veiro (VI. a, 30) = *viros.*
Veru (passim) = *fores.*
Vestra (V. b, 61).
Vinu (passim) = *vinum.*
Viŕseto (VI. a, 28) = *visus.*
Vitlu (II. a, 21) = *vitulus.*
Voku-kom (VI. b, 43) = *cum* vel *in foco.*
Vutu (II. b, 39) = *vultus.*

§ 11. *The Todi Inscription contains four words of the same class.*

In the year 1835 a bronze figure of a man in armour was discovered near *Todi* (*Tuder*), on the borders of Umbria. The inscription, which was detected on the girdle of the breast-plate, has been interpreted from the Greek, Latin, and Hebrew languages by a number of different scholars. It appears to me to contain four words, which may be added to the above list, as they are all explicable from the roots of the Latin language. The inscription runs thus:

AHALTRVTITISPVNVMPEPE.

The word *titis* occurs in the Eugubine Tables (I. b, 45), and *punum* is obviously the accusative of *punus*, another form of *pune, punes, puni*, which are known to be Umbrian words. It is true that the Latin synonym *panis* and the Eugubine words belong to the *i*- declension; but that is no reason why we should not have a by-form of the *o*- declension, and that this form actually existed in Messapia is well known (Athen. III. p. 111 c.: πανὸς ἄρτος Μεσσάπιοι). These two words being removed from the middle, the extremities remain, namely, *ahaltru* and *pepe.* With regard to the first it is to be observed that the lengthening of a syllable, by doubling the vowel and inserting the letter *h*, is common in Umbrian (see Leps. *de Tabb. Eugub.* pp. 92, sqq.), and the same practice is often remarked in Latin.

Indeed, as we have seen above (p. 82), the elongated form is the more ancient and original. *Ahaltru*, then, bears the same relation to the Latin *alter* that *ahala* bears to *ala*, *nihil* to *nil*, *vehemens* to *vemens*, &c. It is true that in the Eugubine Tables *etre* seems to represent the meaning, if not the form of *alter;* but this is no reason why there should not be the other equally genuine and ancient form *alter* or *ahalter*, which is probably the more emphatic word in that language, and corresponds, perhaps, in meaning to the adjective *alienus*. The signification of the word *pepe* suggests itself from the context, and is also supported by analogy. It seems to be a reduplication of the root *pa* (*pâ-nis*, *pa-sco*, πασάσθαι, πα-τέομαι, &c.), analogous to the reduplication of the root *bi* (or *pi*, πί-νω, &c.) in *bi-bo*. If the Sabines were a warrior tribe of Umbrians, it is reasonable to conclude that their name for "a warrior" would be Umbrian also; now we know that the Sabine name for "a warrior" was *titus* (Fest. p. 366, and above, p. 26), and the warrior tribe at Rome was called the *Titienses* (Liv. I. 13); accordingly, as the Umbrian Propertius calls these the *Tities* (*El.* IV. 1, 31: *Hinc Tities Ramnesque viri Luceresque coloni*[1]), it is not an unfair assumption that *titis*, pl. *tities*, was the Umbrian word for "a warrior." We have the same word on an Etruscan monument from Volterra, which represents a warrior with sword and spear, and bears the following legend: *mi afiles Tites* (Inghirami *Mon. Etr. ser.* VI. *tav.* A. Micali *Ant. Mon. tav.* 51. Müller, *Denkmäler*, LXII. n. 312). The inscription, then, will run thus: "the warrior eats another's bread;" the position of *ahaltru* being justified by the emphasis which naturally falls upon it. Compare Dante, *Paradiso*, XVII. 58-60:

> Tu proverai sì come sa di sale
> Lo *pane altrui*, et com' è duro calle
> Lo scendere e 'l salir per l' *altrui* scale.

This motto, then, either refers to the practice of serving as mercenaries, so common among the Italians, or expresses the prouder feeling of superiority to the mere agriculturist, which was equally characteristic of the oldest Greek warriors. Compare the scolion of Hybrias the Cretan (*ap. Athen.* XV. 695 F.):

---

1 *Lucmo* in V. 29 is an accurate transcription of the Etruscan *Lauchme*.

ἔστι μοι πλοῦτος μέγας δόρυ καὶ ξίφος
καὶ τὸ καλὸν λαισήϊον πρόβλημα χρωτός·
τούτῳ μὲν ἀρῶ, τούτῳ θερίζω,
τούτῳ πατέω τὸν ἀδὺν οἶνον ἀπ' ἀμπελω,
τούτῳ δεσπότας μνωΐας κέκλημαι.
τοὶ δὲ μὴ τολμῶντ' ἔχειν δόρυ καὶ ξίφος, κ. τ. λ.

It is also to be remarked that the *Lucumones*, or "illustrious nobles," among the Tuscans, seem to have distinguished their plebeians as *Aruntes* (*ἀροῦντες*), i. e. mere ploughmen and agricultural labourers (Klenze, *Phil. Abhandlung.* p. 39, note). In general the prænomen *Aruns* seems to be used in the old mythical history to designate an inferior person (Müller, *Etrusk.* I. p. 405).

CHAPTER IV.

THE SABELLO-OSCAN LANGUAGE.

1. The remains of the Oscan language must be considered as Sabellian also. § 2. Alphabetical list of Sabello-Oscan words, with their interpretation. § 3. The Bantine Table. § 4. Commentary on the Bantine Table. § 5. *The Cippus Abellanus.* § 6. The bronze tablet of *Agnone.* § 7. The "Atellanæ."

§ 1. *The remains of the Oscan language must be considered as Sabellian also.*

THE Oscan language is more interesting even than the Umbrian, and the remains which have come down to us are much more easily interpreted than the Eugubine Tables. Indeed, as Niebuhr has remarked (I. *ad not.* 212), "some of the inscriptions may be explained word for word, others in part at least, and that too with perfect certainty, and without any violence." This language had a literature of its own, and survived the Roman conquest of southern Italy. It was spoken in Samnium in the year 459;[1] it was one of the languages of Bruttium in the days of Ennius[2]; the greatest relic of Oscan is the Bantine Table, which was probably engraved about the middle of the seventh century; and the Oscan was the common idiom at Herculaneum and Pompeii, when the volcano at once destroyed and preserved those cities.

Although, as it has been shown in a previous chapter, the Sabines must be regarded as a branch of the Umbrian stock, who conquered all the Ausonian nations, and though Varro[3] speaks of the Sabine language as different from the Oscan, yet, as all the remains of the Sabine and Oscan languages belong to a period when the Sabellian conquerors had mixed themselves up with the conquered Ausonians and had learned their language, it seems reasonable that we should not attempt, at this distance of time,

---

[1] Liv. X. 20: "gnaros *linguæ Oscæ* exploratum mittit."

[2] Festus, s. v. *bilingues*, p. 35: "*bilingues Bruttates* Ennius dixit, quod Brutti et Osce et Græce loqui soliti sint."

[3] *L. L.* VII. § 3, p. 130, Müller. Varro was born at Reate (see p. 301 of Müller's edition), and therefore, perhaps, attached peculiar importance to the provincialisms of the *ager Sabinus.*

to discriminate between them, but that, recognising generally the original affinity of the Umbrian and Oscan nations, we should consider the Sabine words which have been transmitted to us, as belonging, not so much to the Umbrian idiom, as to the complex Sabello-Oscan language, which prevailed throughout the whole of southern Italy. And this view of the matter is farther justified by the fact, that a great many of these words are quoted, not only as Sabine, but also as Oscan. It is true that some particular words are quoted as Sabine, which are not found in Oscan inscriptions, and not known to be Oscan also; but we cannot form any general conclusions from such isolated phenomena, especially as a great many of these words are Latin as well. All that it proves is simply this, that there were provincialisms in the *Sabine territory* properly so called. Still less can we think with Müller (*Etrusk.* I. p. 42), that the Sabine language is the un-Greek element in the Oscan; for many of these words have direct connexions with Greek synonyms, as Müller himself has admitted. There are no Sabine inscriptions as such. The Marsian inscription, quoted by Lanzi, and which Niebuhr thought unintelligible (I. 105, *ad not.* 333), is Oscan, if it ought not rather to be called old Latin.

In the following observations, then, for the materials of which I am largely indebted to the writings of Professor Klenze (*Philologische Abhandlungen*, Berlin, 1839,) and of Theodor Mommsen (*Unteritalischen Dialekte*, Leipsig, 1850), the Sabine and Oscan will be treated in conjunction with one another. Before proceeding to consider the Oscan inscriptions, it may be as well to give an alphabetical list of those words which are cited by old writers as Sabine, Oscan, or both.

§ 2. *Alphabetical list of Sabello-Oscan words, with their interpretation.*

Alpus, Sab. Fest. p. 4, Müller: "*Album*, quod nos dicimus, a Græco, quod est ἀλφόν, est appellatum. Sabini tamen *alpum* dixerunt."

Anxur. Plin. H. N. III, 5: "flumen Ufens—lingua Volscorum *Anxur* dictum."

Aurelius. Vide s. v. *Sol*.

Aurum, Sab. Fest. p. 9: "*Aurum*—alii a Sabinis translatum putant, quod illi *ausum* dicebant."

Brutus, Osc. "A runaway slave," "a maroon." Strabo, VI. p. 255: Diod. XVI. 15.

Cascus, Casinus, Casnar, Sab. Osc. Varro, *L. L.* VII. § 28: "*Cascum* significat vetus; ejus origo Sabina, quæ usque radices in Oscam linguam egit." § 29: "Item ostendit quod oppidum vocatur *Casinum;* hoc enim ab Sabinis orti Samnites tenuerunt, et nunc nostri etiam nunc *Casinum* forum vetus appellant. Item significant in Atellanis aliquot Pappum senem, quod Osci *Casnar* appellant." These words probably contain the Sanscr. root *cas-*, "white," which also appears in *καθαρός*, *cas-tus*, &c. *Cānus* is also to be referred to this class (comp. *co-esna*, *cœna*, &c.), and stands related to *candidus*, as *plēnus* does to *s-plendidus*. According to Pott (*Etym. Forsch.* II. 109), *cas-nar* is a compound word, containing the roots *cas-*, "old," and *nṝ*, "man." Lobeck thinks (*Paralip.* p. 22 n.) that *Casnar* is for *canus*, as *Cæsar* and *Cæso* for *Cæsus*.

Catus, Sab. Varro, *L. L.* VII. § 46: "*Cata* acuta; hoc enim verbo dicunt Sabini."

Crepusculum, Sab. Varro, *L. L.* VI. § 5: "Secundum hoc dicitur *crepusculum* a crepero. Id vocabulum sumpserunt a Sabinis, unde veniunt *Crepusci* nominati Amiterno, qui eo tempore erant nati, ut Lucii prima luce. In Reatino *crepusculum* significat dubium; ab eo res dictæ dubiæ *creperæ*, quod crepusculum dies etiam nunc sit an jam nox, multis dubium." VII. § 77: "*Crepusculum* ab Sabinis, quod id dubium tempus noctis an diei sit." Comp. Festus, s. v. *Decrepitus*, p. 71, Müller. The root of this word seems to be contained in the Sanscr. *kshapas*, Greek *κνέφας* (see *New Crat.* § 160).

Cumba, Sab. Festus, p. 64: "*Cumbam* Sabini vocant eam, quam militares lecticam, unde videtur derivatum esse *cubiculum*." Comp. Varro, *L. L.* V. § 166, and Gloss. MS. Camberon. (Voss. *Vit. Serm.* p. 419): "*Cumba* dicitur lectica a *cubando*."

Cupencus, Sab. Serv. *ad Æn.* XII. 538: "Sane sciendum, *cupencum* Sabinorum lingua sacerdotem vocari: sunt autem cupenci Herculis sacerdotes."

Curis, Quiris, Sab. Ovid. *Fast.* II. 475: "Sive quod hasta *curis* priscis est dicta Sabinis." Varro (*ap. Dion. Hal.* II. p. 109, Huds.): *Κύρεις γὰρ οἱ Σαβῖνοι τὰς αἰχμὰς καλοῦσι· ταῦτα μὲν οὖν Τερέντιος Οὐάρρων γράφει.* Macrob. *Sat.* I. 9: "Quirinum quasi bellorum potentem, ab hasta, quam Sa-

bini *curim* vocant." Festus, p. 49: "*Curis* est Sabine hasta. Unde Romulus *Quirinus*, quia eam ferebat, est dictus." Ibid: "*Curitim* Junonem appellabant, quia eandem ferre hastam putabant." p. 63: "Quia matronæ Junonis Curitis in tutela sint, quæ ita appellabatur a ferenda hasta, quæ lingua Sabinorum *Curis* dicebatur." (Comp. Müller, *Etrusk.* II. p. 45, and Festus, p. 254.) Servius, *Æn.* I. 296: "Romulus autem Quirinus ideo dictus est, vel quod hasta utebatur, quæ Sabinorum lingua *Curis* dicitur: hasta enim, i. e. *curis*, telum longum est, unde et *securis*, quasi *semi-curis*." Isidor. IX. 2, 84: "Hi et Quirites dicti, quia Quirinus dictus est Romulus; quod semper hasta utebatur, quæ Sabinorum lingua *quiris* dicitur." Cf. Plutarch. *Vit. Romul.* 29. If *curis* meant "a lance," as these authorities indicate, its meaning was derived from the definition of a lance as "a headed or pointed staff." The analogies suggested by Pott (*Et. Forsch.* I. 263, II. 533) do not lead to any satisfactory result. Some confusion arises in the mind from a comparison of *Quirites*, (*curia*), *curiatii*, "the full citizens or hoplites," with κούρητες, κύριοι, κοίρανοι κοῦροι, κουρίδιος—words denoting "headship" or "personal rank." Comp. *New Cratylus*, § 330; Welcker, *Theognis*, p. xxxiii.; Lobeck, *Aglaopham.* p. 1144, not. c., and *ad Soph. Aj.* 374, 2d edit.; and above p. 24.

Cyprus, Sab. Varro, *L. L.* V. § 159: "Vicus *Cyprius* (Liv. I. 48) a *cypro*, quod ibi Sabini cives additi consederunt, qui a bono omine id appellarunt; nam *cyprum* Sabine *bonum*." The word probably contains the same element as the Persian *khub* (خوب), "good" or "fair." As *Kupra* was the Etruscan Juno, (Strabo, p. 241), this word must have belonged to the Umbrian element common to both languages.

Dalivus, Osc. Fest. p. 68: "*Dalivum* supinum ait esse Aurelius, Ælius stultum. Oscorum quoque lingua significat insanum. Santra vero dici putat ipsum, quem Græci δείλαιον, i. e. propter cujus fatuitatem quis misereri debeat." Comp. Hesych., Δαλίς, μωρός; and see Blomf. *ad Æsch. Eumen.* 318. Labb. Gloss. *daunum*, ἄφρονα, where Scaliger reads *dalivum*.

Diana, Sab. Vide sub v. *Feronia*.

Dirus, Umbr. et Sab. Serv. *ad Æn.* III. 235: "Sabini et Umbri, quæ nos mala *dira* appellant." This word seems to be the same in effect as the Gr. δεινός.

Falacer (cf. *alacer*). Varro, *L. L.* V. § 84, (cf. VII. § 45): "flamen *Falacer* a divo patre *Falacre*." It is supposed by Mommsen that this word was Sabine, because Vespasian's Sabine birth-place was *Falacrine* or *Falacrinum*. If so the word must have belonged to the Umbrian element common to the Sabine and Etruscan: for Varro tells us here that *Falacer* was *divus pater*, or *Jupiter*, and we learn expressly that *falandum* was the Etruscan equivalent to *cœlum* (Fest. p. 88).

Famel, Osc. Fest. p. 87: "*Famuli* origo ab Oscis dependet, apud quos servus *famel* nominabatur, unde et *familia* vocata." Comp. Müller, *Etrusker*, I. p. 38. Benfey (*Wurzel-Lex.* II. 20) would connect *fa-mel* for *fag-mel* with the Sanscrit root *bhag'*, "to honour;" Sclav. *bog*, "god;" Russ. *bog'-itj*, "to honour."

Fasena, Sab. Varro (*ap. Vet. Orthogr.* p. 2230 P.): "Siquidem, ut testis est Varro, a Sabinis *fasena* dicitur." p. 2238: "Itaque *harenam* justius quis dixerit, quoniam apud antiquos *fasena* erat, et *hordeum*, quia *fordeum*, et, sicut supra diximus, *hircos*, quoniam *firci* erant, et *hœdi*, quoniam *fœdi*." The ancients, however, often omitted the aspirate in those words which originally had *f*. Quinctil. *Inst. Orat.* I. 5. § 20: "Parcissime ea (aspiratione) veteres usi sunt etiam in vocalibus, cum *œdos ircosque* dicebant." The *f* is changed into *h* in the proper name *Halesus*—the hero eponymus of the *Falerians*, and founder of *Falisci:* see Turneb. *Adv.* XXI. 3. Below, *Fedus*. For the similar change from *f* to *h* in the Romance languages, see *New Cratylus*, § 111.

Februum, Sab. Varro, *L. L.* VI. § 13: "*Februum* Sabini purgamentum, et id in sacris nostris verbum." Ovid. *Fast.* II. 19: "Februa Romani dixere piamina Patres." Fest. p. 85. Also Tuscan; see J. Lyd. *de Mens.* p. 170.

Fedus, Fœdus, Sab. Varro, *L. L.* V. § 97: "*Ircus*, quod Sabini *fircus;* quod illic *fedus*, in Latio rure *edus;* qui in urbe, ut in multis A addito, *aedus*." Apul. *de Not. Adspir.* p. 94 (Osann.): "M. Terentius scribit *hedum* lingua Sabinorum *fedum* vocatum, Romanosque corrupte *hedus* pro eo quod est *fedus* habuisse, sicut *hircus* pro *fircus*, et *trahere* pro *trafere*." p. 125: "Sabini enim *fircus*, Romani *hircus;* illi *vefere*, Romani *vehere* protulerunt." Fest. p. 84: "*Fœdum* antiqui

dicebant pro *hædo*, *folus* pro *olere*, *fostem* pro *hoste*, *fostem* pro *hostia*." Above, *Fasena*.

Feronia, Sab. Varro. *L. L.* V. § 74: "*Feronia*, *Minerva*, *Novensides* a Sabinis. Paulo aliter ab eisdem dicimus *Herculem*, *Vestam*, *Salutem*, *Fortunam*, *Fortem*, *Fidem*. Et aræ Sabinam linguam olent quæ Tati regis voto sunt Romæ dedicatæ; nam ut Annales dicunt, vovit (1) *Opi*, (2) *Floræ*, (3) *Vediovi Saturno*que, (4) *Soli*, (5) *Lunæ*, (6) *Volcano* et *Summano*, itemque (7) *Larundæ*, (8) *Termino*, (9) *Quirino*, (10) *Vortumno*, (11) *Laribus*, (12) *Dianæ Lucinæ*que. [The figures refer to the XII. altars, according to Müller's view, Festus, p. xliv: comp. *Etrusk.* II. p. 64.] "E quis nonnulla nomina in utraque lingua habent radices, ut arbores, quæ in confinio natæ in utroque agro serpunt: potest enim Saturnus hic de alia causa esse dictus atque in Sabinis, et sic Diana, et de quibus supra dictum est."

Fides, Sab. Above, s. v. *Feronia*.

Fircus, Sab. Above, s. v. *Fedus*.

Flora, Sab. Above, s. v. *Feronia*.

Fors, *Fortuna*. Ibid.

Gela, Osc. Steph. Byzan. voc. Γέλα:—ὁ δὲ ποταμὸς (Γέλα) ὅτι πολλὴν πάχνην γεννᾷ· ταύτην γὰρ τῇ Ὀπικῶν φωνῇ καὶ Σικέλων γέλαν λέγεσθαι.

Hercules, Sab. Above, s. v. *Feronia*.

Herna, Sab. et Marsic. "A rock." Serv. *ad Virg. Æn.* VII. 684. Compare κραν-αός, κάραν-ον; Gael. *carn*; Irish, *cairneach*; Sclav. *kremeni*.

Idus, Sab. Varro, *L. L.* VI. § 28: "*Idus* ab eo quod Tusci *itus*, vel potius quod Sabini *idus* dicunt."

Irpus, Sab. et Samn. Serv. *ad Æn.* XI. 785: "Nam lupi Sabinorum lingua *hirpi* vocantur." Fest. p. 106: "*Irpini* appellati nomine lupi, quem *irpum* dicunt Samnites; eum enim ducem secuti agros occupavere." Strabo, V. p. 250: ἐξῆς δ' εἰσὶν Ἱρπῖνοι, καὶτοὶ Σαννῖται· τοὔνομα δ' ἔσχον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡγησαμένου λύκου τῆς ἀποικίας· ἵρπον γὰρ καλοῦσιν οἱ Σαννῖται τὸν λύκον. Compare the Sanscrit *vṛikas*; and see *New Cratyl.* § 269.

Jupiter, Sab. s. v. *Feronia*.

Lares, Sab. s. v. *Feronia*.

Larunda, Sab. s. v. *Feronia*.

Lebasius, Sab. Serv. *ad Virg. Georg.* I. 7: "Quamvis Sabini Cererem *Panem* appellant, Liberum *Lebasium*." It is probable that the root-syllable should be written *læb-* = *lub-* (see Fest. p. 121, Müller). For the termination we may compare the Sabine name *Vesp-asia*.

Lepestæ, Sab. Varro, *L. L.* V. § 123: "Dictæ *lepestæ*, quæ etiam nunc in diebus sacris Sabinis *vasa vinaria* in mensa deorum sunt posita; apud antiquos scriptores inveni appellari poculi genus λεπαστάν, quare vel inde radices in agrum Sabinum et Romanum sunt profectæ."

Lixula, Sab. Varro, *L. L.* V. § 107: "Circuli, quod mixta farina et caseo et aqua circuitum æquabiliter fundebant. Hoc quidem qui magis incondite faciebant, vocabant *lixulas* et *semilixulas* vocabulo Sabino, itaque frequentati a Sabinis."

Lucetius, Osc. Serv. *ad Æn.* IX. 570: "Lingua Osca *Lucetius* est Jupiter dictus, a luce quam præstare dicitur hominibus."

Lucina, Luna. s. v. *Feronia.*

Mœsius, Osc. Fest. p. 136: "*Mœsius* lingua Osca mensis *Maius*."

Mamers, Osc. et Sab. Fest. p. 131: "*Mamers, Mamertis* facit, *i. e.* lingua Osca *Mars, Martis*, unde et *Mamertini* in Sicilia dicti, qui Messanæ habitant." Id. p. 158: "Et nomen acceperunt unum, ut dicerentur Mamertini, quod conjectis in sortem duodecim deorum nominibus, *Mamers* forte exierat; qui lingua Oscorum *Mars* significatur." Id. p. 131: "*Mamercus* prænomen Oscum est ab eo, quod hi *Martem Mamertem* appellant." Varro, *L. L.* V. § 73: "Mars ab eo, quod maribus in bello præest, aut quod ab Sabinis acceptus, ibi (ubi?) est *Mamers*." This word and its analogies are explained in the next chapter, § 2. The whole subject has been lately reviewed by Corssen, *über die Formen u. Bedentungen des Namen Mars in den ital. Dialekten* (*Zeitschr. f. Vergl. Sprf.* 1852, pp. 1—35), who proposes to consider *Mavors* as a contraction of *Mar-mar* with a formative *t*, which is also found in *Mars* (*Mar-t-*).

Meddix, Osc. Liv. XXVI. 6: "*Medix* tuticus summus apud Campanos magistratus." Comp. XXIV. 19. (The old reading was *mediastaticus*.) Fest. p. 123: "*Meddix* apud Oscos nomen magistratus est." Ennius: "Summus ibi capitur *Med-*

dix, occiditur alter" (*Annal.* VIII. 73). In this passage from Ennius, Dacier reads *unus* for *summus*. This appears unnecessary: *Meddix* occurs in the Oscan inscriptions with the epithets *degetasius*, *fortis*, and *tuticus*; *summus* may be another epithet of the same kind. The word *Meddix* appears to be connected in origin with the Greek μέδων. The proper name *Mettius* (Fest. p. 158), or *Mettus* (Liv. I. 23), seems to have been this word *Meddix*. At least Livy says that *Mettus* Fuffetius was made *dictator* of Alba; and Festus speaks of Sthennius *Mettius* as *princeps* of the Samnites. So, also, we have ΜΕΔΔΕΙΞ ΟΥΦΕΝΣ (*Meddix Ufens*) in the inscription given by Castelli di Torremuzza, *Sicil. vet. Inscr.* V. 45, p. 55: see Müller, *Etrusk.* II. p. 69, note. Knötel proposes (*Zeitschr. f. d. Alterthumsw.* 1850, p. 420) to consider *Med-dix* = *medium-dicens* as a compound analogous to *ju-dex* = *jus-dicens*, *vindex* = *vim-dicens*, &c. The last word is more truly explained with reference to *ven-eo*, *ven-do*, and *ven-dico*; and as *medix* is properly spelt with one *d* (see Schömann's *Greifswald Program für* 1840), it would be better to consider *med-* as the root and *x* = *c-s* as a mere formative ending: cf. *medicus*. In somewhat later times the Sabello-Oscans called their dictator by the name *embratur*, which is evidently a shortened form of the Latin *im-perator*, or *indu-perator*. Liv. VIII. 39; IX. 1; X. 29. Oros. V. 15: "Postquam sibi Samnites Papium Mutilum *imperatorem* præfecerant." Similarly we have coins with the Oscan inscription, *G. Paapi G. Mutil Embratur*; which refer to the time of the Social War, when the forces of the confederacy were divided into two armies, each under its own *imperator*, the Marsi being under the orders of *Q. Popædius Silo*, the Samnites having for their leader this *Gaius Papius Mutilus*, the son of *Gaius*. Of *tuticus*, see below.

Minerva, Sab. s. v. *Feronia*.

Multa, Osc. et Sab. Fest. p. 142: "*Multam* Osce dici putant pœnam quidam. M. Varro ait pœnam esse, sed pecuniariam, de qua subtiliter in Lib. I. quæstionum Epist. I. refert." Cf. p. 144. s. v. *Maximam multam*. Varro, *apud Gell.* XI. 1: "Vocabulum autem ipsum *multæ* idem M. Varro uno et vicesimo rerum humanarum non Latinum sed Sabinum esse dicit, idque ad suam memoriam mansisse ait in lingua Samnitium, qui sunt a Sabinis orti."

Nar, Sab. Virg. *Æn.* VII. 517: "Sulfurea *Nar* albus aqua." Ubi Serv.: "Sabini lingua sua *nar* dicunt sulfur."

Ner, nerio, Sab. Suet. *Vit. Tiber.* I.: "Inter cognomina autem et *Neronis* adsumpsit, quo significatur lingua Sabina *fortis* ac *strenuus*." Gell. XIII. 22: "*Nerio* a veteribus sic declinatur, quasi Anio; nam proinde ut Anienem, sic Nerienem dixerunt, tertia syllaba producta; id autem, sive *Nerio* sive *Nerienes* est, Sabinum verbum est, eoque significatur *virtus* et *fortitudo*. Itaque ex Claudiis, quos a Sabinis oriundos accepimus, qui erat egregia atque præstanti fortitudine *Nero* appellatus est. Sed id Sabini accepisse a Græcis videntur, qui vincula et firmamenta membrorum *νεῦρα* dicunt, unde nos quoque nervos appellamus." Lydus, *de Mens.* IV. 42. Id. *de Magistr.* I. 23. Compare the Sanscr. *nṛĭ*; and see above, p. 106, s. v. *Cas-nar*: cf. p. 97.

Novensides, Ops. Sab. s. v. *Feronia.*

Panis=Ceres, Sab. s. v. *Lebasius.*

Panos, Messap. Athen. III. p. 111 c.: *πανὸς ἄρτος Μεσσάπιοι.* This is a confirmation of *punus* for *panis* in the Umbrian inscription (p. 101).

Petora, petorritum, Osc. Fest. p. 206: "*Petoritum* et Gallicum vehiculum est, et nomen ejus dictum esse existimant a numero IIII. rotarum; alii Osce, quod hi quoque *petora* quattuor vocent; alii Græce, sed *αἰολικῶς* dictum." Comp. Quinctil. *Inst. Orat.* I. 5, § 57. The Æolic Greek wrote *πέσσυρες, πέσσαρα*, or *πίσυρα*, or *πέτορες, πέτορα*. In Gaelic we have *peder*. The Doric Gr. was *τέτορες*. In general we have *τ* in Gr. where we have *qv* in Latin, and in these cases we have *p* in Oscan: *e. g.* Osc. *pis*, Lat. *qvis*, Gr. *τίς*; and the Oscans wrote *Tarpinius, Ampus*, for the Lat. *Tarquinius, Ancus.* But *qv* was so agreeable to the Roman articulation, that we find *qv* in Latin words where we have not *τ* but *π* in Greek. Comp. *πῆ, πέντε* (*πέμπε*), *ἵππος, ἕπομαι, λείπω, λίπα* (*λιπαρός*), *ὄπτιλος, ἐνέπει, πατάσσω, πέπτω, ἧπαρ*, with *qua, quinque, equus, sequor, linquo, liqueo, oquulus, in-quit* (*quoth* Angl., *quêthan* Anglo-Sax., *gwedyd* Welsh[1]), *quatio, quoquo,*

[1] See below, Chap. XI. § 7. We have the present tense of *quoth* in the English word *be-queath*; cf. *be-speak.*

jecur. For *petor-ritum* (*petor*, "four," *rad*, Sanscrit *ratha*, "a wheel") see Heindorf on Hor. *Sat.* I. 6, 104.

Picus, Sab. Strabo, V. § 2: πῖκον γὰρ τὴν ὄρνιν τοῦτον ὀνομάζουσι καὶ νομίζουσιν Ἄρεως ἱερόν.

Pipatio, Osc. Fest. p. 212: "*Pipatio* clamor plorantis lingua Oscorum."

Pitpit, Osc. Fest. p. 212: "*Pitpit* Osce quidquid." Above, s. v. *Petora.*

Porcus, Sab. Varro, *L. L.* V. § 97: "*Porcus* quod Sabinis dictum *Aprimo Porco-por*, inde porcus; nisi si a Græcis, quod Athenis in libris sacrorum scripta κάπρῳ καὶ πόρκῳ."

Quirinus, Salus, Sab. s. v. *Feronia.*

Sancus, Sab. Varro, *L. L.* V. § 66: "Ælius Dium Fidium dicebat Diovis filium, ut Græci Διὸς κόρον Castorem, et putabat hunc esse Sancum ab Sabina lingua, et Herculem a Græca." Lyd. *de Mens.* 58: τὸ σάγκος ὄνομα οὐρανὸν σημαίνει τῇ Σαβίνων γλώσσῃ.

Saturnus, Sab. s. v. *Feronia.*

Scensa, Sab. Fest. p. 339: "*Scensas* [Sabini dicebant, quas] nunc cenas, quæ autem nunc prandia, cenas habebant, et pro ceni[s vespernas antiqui]." Comp. Paul. Diac. in p. 338.

Sol, Sab. s. v. *Feronia*; see also Varro, *L. L.* V. §§ 27, 68; but Festus says (p. 20): "Aureliam familiam, ex Sabinis oriundam, a Sole dictum putant, quod ei publice a populo Romano datus sit locus, in quo sacra faceret Soli, qui ex hoc *Auseli* dicebantur, ut Valesii, Papisii, pro eo quod est Valerii, Papirii." —And on an Etruscan mirror *Usil* appears as the name of a figure armed with a bow, which probably represents Apollo, (*Bullett.* 1840, p. 11); and this would seem to confirm Müller's suggestion (see *Berlin. Jahrbücher*, August 1841, p. 222, note) that the whole word *Ausil* was the name of the Sun-god, both in the Sabine and in the Etruscan language. The word *Aurelius*, however, brings us much nearer to *Aurora*, and while we have the word *Usil* on Etruscan monuments in connexion with the figure of *Aurora* (Gerhard, *Arch. Zeitung*, 1847, *Anh.* no. 1. p. 9), we find from the obvious reading in a gloss of Hesychius that the Etruscan word really meant "the morning" rather than "the sun:" αὐκήλως *l.* αὐσήλ[ως], ἕως ὑπὸ Τυῤῥηνῶν. And as the Sabines said *ausum* from *aurum*, we may probably refer both words to the Sanscrit root *ush* = *urere*, and explain the name of the metal from the red glare of

light, which is common to it and to the sun-rise: whence Varro says (*L. L.* V. § 83): "aurora dicitur ante solis ortum, ab eo quod ab igni solis tum *aureo* aer *aurescat*." The slight confusion between the sun and his early light is easily accounted for, and excused: and on the whole it seems better to suppose that *sol*, from the Sanscrit root *swar* = *cœlum* (Pott, *Etym. Forsch.* I. p. 131), and *ausel*, from *ush* = *urere*, were independent, but partly commutable Sabine and Etruscan words.

Sollo, Osc. Fest. p. 298: "*Sollo* Osce dicitur id quod nos *totum* vocamus. Lucilius: *vasa quoque omnino redimit, non sollo dupundi*, i. e. non tota. Idem Livius. *Sollicuria*, in omni re curiosa. Et *solliferreum* genus teli, totum ferreum. *Sollers* etiam in omni re prudens [comp. Sanscr. *sarvârtha*]; et *sollemne*, quod omnibus annis præstari debet."

Strebula, Umbr. Fest. p. 313: "*Strebula* Umbrico nomine Plautus appellat coxendices quas G[ræci μήρια dicunt, quæ] in altaria in[poni solebant, ut Plau]tus ait in Fri[volaria]." Varro, *L. L.* VII. § 67: "*Stribula*, ut Opilius scribit, circum coxendices sunt bovis; id Græcum est ab ejus loci versura." Arnob. *adv. Gent.* VII. 24: "Non enim placet carnem *strebulam* nominari quæ taurorum e coxendicibus demitur."

Strena, Sab. Elpidian. *ap. Lyd. de Mens.* IV. 4: ὁ δὲ Ἐλπιδιανὸς ἐν τῷ περὶ ἑορτῶν στρήναν τὴν ὑγίειαν τῇ Σαβίνων φωνῇ λέγεσθαι φησιν. Comp. Symmach. *Ep.* X. 35; Festus, p. 313; and the Germ. *strenge*, Engl. *strong*, Lat. *strenuus*, Gr. στρηνής, στρῆνος, &c. For another sense of *strena*, see Fest. p. 313.

Summanus, Sab. s. v. *Feronia*.

Supparus, Osc. Varro, *L. L.* V. § 131: "Indutui alterum quod subtus, a quo subucula; alterum quod supra, a quo *supparus*, nisi id, quod item dicunt Osci."

Tebœ, Sab. Varro, *R. R.* III. 1, 16: "Nam lingua prisca et in Græcia Æoleis Bœotii sine afflatu vocant collis *tebas;* et in Sabinis, quo e Græcia venerunt Pelasgi, etiamnunc ita dicunt; cujus vestigium in agro Sabino via Salaria non longe a Reate milliarius clivus appellatur *Thebœ*." The word therefore, according to Varro, was Pelasgian as well as Sabine.

Terenum, Sab. Macrob. *Sat.* II. 14: "A *tereno*, quod est Sabinorum lingua molle, unde *Terentios* quoque dictos putat Varro ad Libonem primo." Comp. the Gr. τέρην.

Terminus, Sab. s. v. *Feronia.*

Tesqua, Sab. *Schol. Hor. Epist.* I. 14, 19: "Lingua Sabinorum loca difficilia et repleta sentibus sic (*tesqua*) nominantur."

Testis, Sab. Labb. *Gloss. Nom.* p. 32: "Testis *μάρτυς τῇ τῶν Σαβίνων φωνῇ.*"

Touticus, Osc. Liv. XXVI. 6: "Medix *tuticus.*" The *Itinerarium Hierosolym.* explains the name of the city *Equus-Tuticus*, which Horace could not fit to his verse (I. *Sat.* 5, 87), by *equus magnus.* Though it is possible, however, that *touticus* might in a secondary application bear this signification, it is more probable that it is the adj. from *tuta* = *civitas*, and that it means *publicus* or *civicus.* Abeken thinks (*Mittelitalien*, p. 100) that the word *equus* in this compound is the ethnical name *Æquus;* but the version of the *Itinerarium* is confirmed by the inscription of Nuceria, published by Pellicano in 1840: "M. Virtio . M. T. Men. Cerauno . Ædili . II Vir . Jure . dicundo . præfecto . fabrum . V. Vir . cui . decuriones . ob . munificentiam . ejus . quod . *equum* . *magnum* . posuerat . et . denarios . populo . dedicatione . ejus . dederat . duumviratum . gratuitum . dederunt . Nuceriæ." So that the city may have derived its name from some such symbolical steed erected in the market-place, which was at once "great" and "public." Cf. *Abella* = *Aperula* = *Boartown* or *Borton.*

Trabea, Sab. Lydus *de Mens.* I. 19.

Trafere, Sab. Above, s. v. *Fedus.*

Trimodia, Sab. *Schol. Hor. Serm.* I. 1, 53: "Cumeræ dicuntur vasa minora quæ capiunt quinque sive sex modios, quæ lingua Sabinorum *trimodiæ* dicuntur."

Ungulus, Osc. Fest. p. 375: "Ungulus Oscorum lingua *anulus.*" Comp. Plin. *H. N.* XXXIII. 1.

Vacuna, Sab. Horat. I. *Epist.* X. 49: "Post fanum putre *Vacunæ.*" Porphyr. ad l.: "*Vacuna* apud Sabinos plurimum colitur...Varro...Victoriam ait et ea maxime hi gaudent qui sapientia vincunt." She seems to have been the goddess of Victory, whether she approximated in this capacity to *Bellona*, to *Minerva*, to *Diana*, or to *Ceres;* and the old temple, mentioned by Horace, was restored under this name by the Sabine Emperor Vespasian: vide Orelli, *Corp. Inscript.* no. 1868.

Vedius, Sab. s. v. *Feronia.*

Vefere, Sab. s. v. *Fedus.*
Veia, Osc. Fest. p. 368: "*Veia* apud Oscos dicebatur plaustrum."
Vesperna, Sab. s. v. *Scensa.*
Vesta, Volcanus, Vertumnus, Sab. s. v. *Feronia.*

§ 3. *The Bantine Table.*

The most important fragment of the Oscan language is carved on a bronze tablet, which was found in the year 1793 at Oppido, on the borders of Lucania, and which is called the *Tabula Bantina* on account of the name *Bansæ* occurring in the inscription, which seems to refer to the neighbouring city of Bantia in Apulia[1]. On the other side is a Latin inscription, which will be considered in its proper place.

The Oscan Bantine inscription contains thirty-eight lines or fragments of lines. Of these lines four to twenty-six are complete at the beginning; and lines eleven to thirty-three have preserved the ends entire: consequently there are some sixteen lines which may be read throughout. Of course, the certainty and facility of the interpretation vary materially with the completeness of the fragment; and while many passages in the intermediate lines may be made out almost word for word, we are left to mere conjecture for the broken words and sentences at the beginning and end. The following is a copy of the Table.

1. . . . *s . nom* [*f*]*ust, izic ru* . . . . . .
2. . . . *suæ l*(*e*) *l*(*e*)*p*(*tif*)*us . q . moltam . angit . u . amnur* . . .
3. . . . *deivast . maimas . carneis . senateis . tanginud . am* . . .
4. XL. . *osii* . . . . *ioc . egmo . comparascuster . suae . pis . pertemust . pruter . pan* . . . .
5. *deivatud . sipus . komonei . perum . dolom . mallom . siom . ioc . comono . mais . egm .*
6. *cas . amnud . pan . pieis . umbrateis . auti . cadeis . amnud . inim . idic . siom . dat . senat* . . .

---

[1] It was bought for the Museo Borbonico for 400 scudi.

7. *tanginud . maimas . carneis . pertumum . piei . ex . comono . pertemest . izic . eizeic . zicel .*
8. *comono . ni . hipid pis . pocapit . post . post . exac . comono . hafiert . meddis . dat . castrid . loufi[rud] . [auti] . . .*
9. *en . eituas . factud . pous . touto . deivatuns . tanginom . deicans . siom . dat . eizasc . idic . tangineis . . .*
10. *deicum . pod . valaemom . touticom . tadait . ezum . nep . fe[f]acid . pod . pis . dat . eizac . egmod . min . . .*
11. *deivaid . dolud . malud . suae . pis . contrud . exeic . fefacust . auti . comono . hipust . molto . etan .*
12. *to . estud . n . ⊕⊕ . in . suae . pis . ionc . fortis . meddis . moltaum . herest . ampert . minstreis . aeteis .*
13. *eituas . moltas . moltaum . licitud . suae . pis . prumeddixud . altrei . castrous . auti . eituas*
14. *zicolom . dicust . izic . comono . ni . hipid . ne . pon . op . toutad . petirupert . urust . sipus . perum . dolom .*
15. *mallom . in . trutum . zico . touto . peremust . petiropert . neip . mais . pomtis . com . preivatud . actud .*
16. *pruter . pam . medicat . inom . didist . in . pon . posmom . con . preivatud . urust . eisucen . ziculud .*
17. *zicolom . xxx . nesimum . comonom . ni . hipid . suae . pis . contrud . exeic . fefacust . ionc . suae . pis .*
18. *herest . meddis . moltaum . licitud . ampert . mistreis . aeteis . eituas . licitud . pon . censtur.*
19. *[B]ansae . tautam . censazet . pis . ceus . Bantins . fust . censamur . esuf . in . eituam . poizad . ligud .*

20. *aisc (?) censtur . censaum . anget . uzet . aut . suae . pis . censtomen . nei . cebnust . dolud . mallud .*
21. *in . eizeik . vincter . esuf . comenei . lamatir . prmeddixud . toutad . praesentid . perum . dolum .*
22. *mallom . in . amiricatud . allo . famelo . in . ei . siuom . paei . eizeis . fust . pa . ancensto . fust .*
23. *toutico . estud . pr . suae . praefucus . pod . post . exac . Bansae . fust . suae . pis . op . eizois . com .*
24. *a[l]trud . ligud . acum . herest . auti . prumedicatud . manimaserum . eizazunc . egmazum .*
25. *pas . ex . aiscen . ligis . scriftas . set . nep . him . pruhipid . mais . sicolois . x . nesimois . suae . pis . contrud .*
26. *exeic . pruhipust . molto . etanto . estud . n . Φ . in . suae . pis . ionk . meddis . moltaum . herest . licitud .*
27. [*ampert*] *minstreis . aeteis . eituas . moltas . moltaum . licitud pr . censtur . Bansae .*
28. [*ni . pis . fu*]*id . nei . suae . q . fust . nep . censtur . fuid . nei . suae . pr . fust . in . suae . pis . pr . in . suae .*
29. . . . . *uii . q . pis . tacus . im . nerum . fust . izic . post . eizuc . tr . pl . ni . fuid . suae . pis .*
30. ....[*p*]*ocapid . Bansa*[*e*] . [*f*]*ust . izik . amprufid . facus . estud . idic . medicim . eizuk .*
31. *m . z . . m . nerum . medicim . . . . sinum* . VI . *nesimum .*
32. . *om* [*j*]*udex . iicfep . . . . mum . pod .*
33. . *m . luii . suæ . . eizs . s . . . . . medicim .*
34. . . *nistreis a*[*e*]*teis i*
35. . . *est licitud tr .*
36. . . *comipid irucis . . .*
37. . . *tr*[*p*]*l estud . . .*
38. . . *timom . . . .*

§ 4. *Commentary on the Bantine Table.*

In the first line we have only the words *fust* = *fuerit* and *izic* = *is*, which are of frequent occurrence.

In l. 2 we read: *Q. moltam angit . u.* *Q.* is the common abbreviation for *quæstor*, whose business it was to collect such fines: compare *Mus. Ver.* p. 469: QVAISTORES . . . . AIRE . MVLTATICOD . DEDERONT. We have seen above that *multa* s. *molta* is recognised as a Sabello-Oscan word; and it is of course equivalent to the Latin *multa*. As *anter* is the Oscan form of *inter*, we might suppose that *an-git.u* was for *in-igit .o*. But a comparison of the Oscan inscriptions XXIV. 18 (p. 71 Leps.): *meddiss degetasiús araget*, and XXVII. 38 (p. 86 Leps.): *meddís degetasis arageted multas* (which are obviously, with the common change of *d* to *r*, *meddix degetasius adiget* and *meddix degetasius adigito multas*), would rather show that *angit.u*[*d*] is an abbreviation of *adigito*, the dental liquid representing the dental mute.

L. 3: *deivast maimas karneis*[1] *senateis tanginud.* The first word is the conjunctive of *divavit*, which occurs in the inscription quoted by Lanzi (*Saggio*, III. p. 533), and we have the imperative *deivatud* in l. 5, *deivatuns* in l. 9, and *deivaid* in l. 11. *Deivo* must be identical with *divo* in Lanzi's inscription, which runs thus: V. ATII DIVAVIT TUNII IRINII II. T. IRINII PATRII DONO MIIIL I. LIB . . . T. We have also *deivames* on the Crecchio Inscription, and Knötel would connect the verb with *devoveo*, (*Zeitschr. f. d. Alterthumsw.* 1850, p. 419). Etymologically this is obviously wrong: but if we adopt Mommsen's derivation from *divus*, so that *divare* means *consecrare* or *divinum facere*, the meaning will come to this. *Maimas karneis* must mean *maximi* (in old Latin *maximae*) *cardinis*. So *mais* in ll. 15, 25, signifies *magis*; comp. the French *mais*: and *d* is often omitted in derivatives from the Latin, as in *mi-nuit* for *media nocte*. The *cardo maximus* refers to the main line in the *templum* in Roman land-surveying, and thus in l. 7, we have *maimas karneis pertumum*. As *deivo* and *pertemo* are manifestly transitive verbs (cf. *comono pertemest*, l. 7), the gen. *maimas*

[1] In the second transcription I have substituted *k* for *c*, for the reasons given by Lepsius (*ad Inscr.* p. 150).

karneis must be explained as an expression of measurement or value. *Tanginud*, which occurs elsewhere, was probably an ablative case, corresponding to the accus. *tanginom* (l. 9). We have the same phrase, *senateis tanginúd*, in the *Cippus Abellanus*, I. 8; and it is probably equivalent to the *de senatuos sententiad* of the *senatus-consultum de Bacchanalibus*. If so, the root *tag-* (with nasal insertion *ta-n-g-*) occurred in Oscan as well as in Greek.

L. 4: *suæ pis pertemust*. The first two words, *suæ pis*, i. e. *si quis*, are of constant occurrence in this Table. For the form of *suæ = si*, see *New Cratylus*, § 205. So *suad = sic* (Müller, *Suppl. Ann. in Fest.* p. 411). *Pertemust* is the perf. subjunctive of a verb *pertimere*, which seems to mean "to portion off" or "divide:" comp. *pertica*, *templum*, τέμενος, τέμνω, *con-temno*, &c.

L. 5: *komonei* seems to be the locative of a word *com-unus*, synonymous with *com-munis*, and designating the *ager publicus*, i. e. τὸ κοινόν. *Perum dolum mallom siom = per dolum malum suum*. The preposition *per-um* seems to be a compound like its synonym *am-pert* (12, &c.). *Iok komo-*[*no*] is perhaps *hoc com-unum: ionc* stands in this inscription for *hunc* or *eum-ce*.

L. 6: *-kas amnud*. In Lepsius' transcript this is written as one word; but in the original there is a vacant space between the two, and *-kas* is clearly the end of some mutilated word, the beginning of which was broken off from the end of the preceding line. *Amnud* occurs again in this line, and also in the *Cippus Abellanus*, l. 17. It seems to be the abl. of some noun. Mommsen translates it *causa*, and some such meaning is required. At any rate, it governs a genitive in both clauses of this comparative sentence. For *egmo* is a feminine noun, as appears from its ablative *egmad*, l. 10; gen. pl. *egmazum*, l. 24. Consequently *-kas* must represent the gen. sing. of some adjective agreeing with *eg-mas*. Mommsen derives *eg-mo* from *egere*, so that it means "need or business." As *umbrateis* is clearly *imperati* (cf. *embratur* with *imperator*), and as *kadeis* may be the genitive of some noun signifying "permission" (cf. *cadum*, χα-ν-δάνω, χατέω, *careo*, &c.), the whole passage will mean: *magis negotii proprii causâ, quam alicujus imperati aut permissi causâ*. *Pieis* and *piei* in this line and the next are the gen. and dat. of *pis = quis*.

L. 8: *ni hipid*, i. e. *ne habeat:* conf. ll. 11, 14, 17; also *pru-hipid* (25) = *præhibeat*, and *pru-hipust* (26) = *præhibuerit*. *Post post* is probably an error of the engraver for *pod post*, for *pod* = *quod* signifies *quando* in l. 23; or we must omit the former *post* as an unmeaning interpolation. *Post-eṡak* = *post-hac* or *post-eak: eṡak* is the accus. neut. pl. of the pronoun *esus*, which we have also in the Eugubine Tables, the *-k*, *-ke*, being subjoined, as in the Latin *hic* = *hi-ce*. This is a most instructive form, as bearing immediately on a difficulty which has long been felt in Latin etymology. The quantity of the last syllables of *anteā*, *intereā*, *posteā*, *proptereā*, seems at first sight irreconcilable with the supposition that these words are the prepositions *ante*, *inter*, &c., followed by the neut. accus. *ea*. And a comparison with *post-hac*, *adversus hac* (Fest. p. 246, l. 8, &c.), might lead to the supposition that they are ablatives feminine, the regimen of the prepositions being changed, as is certainly the case in Umbrian. This is, at any rate, the opinion of Klenze (*Phil. Abhandl.* p. 45) and Müller (*ad Fest.* p. 247). Another philologer supposes that they may be deduced from the accus. *eam*, on the analogy of *post-quam*, *ante-quam*, &c. (*Journal of Education*, i. 106). But this opinion has nothing to support it. It is much more reasonable to suppose that the demonstrative pronoun, in Latin as in Oscan, being generally followed by the termination *-ce*, made its neut. pl. in *-a-ce* or *-æc:* we have an instance of this in the demonstrative *hi-c*, the neut. pl. of which is *hæc*, not *ha-ce* or *ha*. Now as this form has become *ha-c* in *posthac*, and as *qua-ce* has become *quæ*, we may understand that, as *quæ-propter* becomes *quā-propter*, so *ante-ea-ce*, or *ante-eæc*, might become *ant'eā;* and so of the others. At least, there is no other way of explaining the neuter forms *quæ* and *hæc*. *Post-eṡa-k* is therefore a synonym for *post-hæc* = *post-hac*. See below, Ch. X. § 4.

Pokapit (in the *Cippus Abell.* l. 52, *pukkapid*) may be rendered *quandocunque*, and compared with the obsolete *concapit*, if this is equivalent to *quocunque* in Festus (p. 364, Müller): *tignum junctum ædibus vineave, et concapit, ne solvito;* where however a different interpretation may be given: see below, Ch. VI. § 12. Fr. 7. The ablatives *kastrid loufirud* must mean *prædio libero*. In l. 13 we have *kastrous* also contrasted to *eituas*, which must = *pecunia*, and so we have an opposition of *land* to *money*

in each case. Of the difference of form between *kastrid* and *kastrous* there is no explanation on the hypothesis that they are cases of the same noun. The former may be the ablative of a word analogous to *campes-ter*, *seges-ter*. The latter must be the accusative plural of a derivative from this under the form -υς or Ϝις (*New Crat.* § 257). The forms μήτρως, μητρυιός, πάτρως, πατρῷος, sufficiently vindicate the addition of Ϝις to the affix $t + r$ (*New Crat.* § 414), and the Umbrian *kastruvuf*, the accus. pl. of an adjective *kastruvus*, proves the existence of such an extension in the old Italian languages. With an ellipsis of *ager* the new adjective would become substantival, and this is apparently the case with *kastrov-s*, the accus. pl. of the apocopized *kastrov*. The root *cas-*, which occurs in the Latin *cas-tus*, *casa*, *cas-trum*, conveys the idea of inclosure, purity, and protection (*New Crat.* § 267). Consequently *castris* or *castrous ager* is an inclosed field like the old English "town." There is an unobserved connexion between *castrum* and *prædium*. The latter is derived from *præs* (*præd* = *præ-vad*), "a surety in money-matters," and this noun includes *vas*, (*vad-*, "wad") the more general name for "a bail." The same term is also included in *custos* (*custod-* = *cast-vad-*); and while this word combines the idea of surety with that of protection, *præs* combines the idea of surety with that of substitution; there is the same opposition between *castrum* or *custodium* the place of security, and *prædium* the property which represents a man's person. The form *loufir* for *liber* is justified by the old form *læber* = *luber* (Fest. p. 121); which is farther supported by the Greek ἐλεύθερος; cf. ἔρυθρος with *ruber*, &c.

L. 10: *pod valæmom toutikom tadait ezum nep fepakid pod pis dat*, i. e. [*si quis fecit*] *quod salutem publicam tardet ex iis, neque fecit, quod quis dat* [*faciendum*]. *Tadait* appears to contain the root of *tædet*, which is connected in sense and etymology with *tardus;* the *r* is only an assimilation to the *d*. Similarly we have: "*pigere* interdum pro *tardari*," Festus, p. 213, Müller. *Fepakid* is only an error for *fefakid*, like *docud* for *dolud* in the next line. We see from this and the conjunctive *fefakust*, which follows, that the Oscans formed the preterite of *facio* by reduplication, and not by lengthening the root-syllable (*New Crat.* § 377).

The passage from l. 11 to the end of the paragraph may be

supplied and explained as follows: *suæ pis contrud eseik fefakust, auti komono hip*[*ust*], [*molto*] [*etan*]*to estud n.* Ⓓ Ⓓ., *in suæ pis ionk fortis meddis moltaum herest ampert mi*[*nstreis ae*]*teis eituas moltas moltaum likitud:* i. e. *si quis adversus hæc fecerit, aut com-unum* (i. e. *agrum publicum*) *habuerit* (i. e. *possederit*), *multa tanta esto numi* CIↃ.CIↃ, *inde si quis eum validus magistratus multare voluerit usque ad minores partes pecuniæ multas multare liceto.* It is easy to restore *molto etanto* from l. 26 infra. *Multa tanta* refers to what has preceded, like the *siremps lex esto* of the Roman laws. The sum is denoted by the numeral sign, which was subsequently represented by CIↃ, just as II.S. became H. S. *Fortis meddix* = *validus magistratus* (see Festus, p. 84, s. v. *forctes*), in other words, "a magistrate of sufficient authority." *Molta-um* is the old infinitive of *multo*. *Herest* is the perf. subj. of a verb *hero*, "to choose" or "take" (root *hir*, "a hand," Sanscr. *hṝ*), which occurs in the Umbrian Tables with a slight variety of meaning. In the Latin Bantine Table (l. 7) we have *quei volet magistratus* in a parallel clause. That *ampert* is a preposition is clear, and it is also obvious that it denotes extension; but that it is to be referred to *ἀμφὶ περί*, as Grotefend proposes, is not so manifest. I should rather think that *pert* is a termination here, as in *petiro-pert* (l. 15); and if so, it qualifies the prepos. *am*, corresponding to the German *um*, which is also used with qualifying terminations, whether prepositional or otherwise: compare the Latin *ad-versus, in-usque,* &c.; and as *petiropert* signifies *usque ad quatuor* and *pert viam* (*Cipp. Abellan.* l. 33) = *usque ad viam*, we may render *am-pert* by *in-usque* or *usque ad*. *Minstreis æteis* is supplied from ll. 18, 27. The word *minis-ter* is the correlative of *magis-ter;* and as *magistri* or *magistratus* were the *higher* public functionaries, so *ministri* were those who did the state service in a *subordinate* capacity—*lictores, viatores*, and such like. Here *minister* is a general adjective corresponding to *minor*. The phrase *ampert minstreis aeteis eituas* occurs again in l. 18, and may be explained by the Latin inscription on this table, where we find l. 10: *dum minoris partis familias taxat.* If this is the true interpretation, *aetis* signifies "a part," and is connected with the root *vid-* in *vidua, di-vido*, with the Etruscan *itus*, Sabine *idus* (Varro, *L. L.* VI. § 28), just as *Achivus* is related to Ἀχαιός,

æquus to *in-iquus*, &c. For the relation between *vĭd-* and *ĭd-* see *New Crat.* § 116, where the principle was first indicated. Klenze takes *eituas* for *istas;* and Grotefend translates it *ærarii.* It is nearly certain that *eitua* = *pecunia;* if so, the word may be derived from *æs;* in which case we shall have *æ*[*s*]*tuus* by the side of *æs-timus* (preserved in *æs-timo:* see below, Ch. VII. § 5), just as we have both *ædi-tuus* and *ædi-timus* (Festus, p. 13).

L. 13: *suæ pis pru-meddišud altrei castrous auti eituas zikolom dicust, izik komono ni hipid:* i. e. *si quis pro magistratu alii prædiaria aut pecunias in sicilicum* (i. e. *portionem*) *dicaverit, is comunum ne habeat. Prumeddišud* seems to be much the same as *prumedikatud,* l. 24. *Pru* stands for *præ* or *pro:* so we have *pruter* (l. 16), *pruhipid* (l. 25), for *præter, præhibeat.* The *ziculus,* mentioned in this and other passages of the Table, seems to be the *sicilicus* (from *seco*), which was, in land-measuring, $\frac{1}{48}$ of the *juger,* or six hundred square feet (Columella, V. 1. 9): in general it expressed subdivision, and was $\frac{1}{48}$ of the *as,* or $\frac{1}{4}$ of the *semuncia* in money-reckoning (Fest. p. 366: *Sicilicum dictum quod semunciam secet;* Labb. *Gloss.: Sicilicum,* τέταρτον οὐγκίας; Böckh, *Metrolog. Untersuchung.* p. 160), and also $\frac{1}{48}$ of the *quinaria* (Frontin. *de Aquæd.* c. 28), and of the *hora* (Plin. XVIII. 32).

L. 14: *ne pon op toutad petirupert urust sipus p. d. m.* The first words here are very obscure. Klenze joins *optoutad,* which he translates *propterea.* Mommsen translates *op toutad* "a populo." *Petirupert* seems to coincide with the Umbrian *petur-pursus* (*Eug. Tab.* VI. b. 11), i. e. *usque ad quatuor:* see on l. 12. *Urust* is the perf. *subj.* of *urvo* s. *urbo* = *aratro definio, circumdo* (Fest. p. 375; Pomponius, *L.* 239, § 6, *de Verb. Signif.*), whence *urbs,* and perhaps *orbis. Sipus p. d. m.,* "knowingly and with evil design." *Sipus* = *sibus,* for which see Fest. p. 336.

L. 15: *petiro-pert neip mais pomtis* = *usque ad quatuor neque plus quinque.* It is known that the Samnite proper name *Pontius* corresponds to the Latin *Quintius* (see *New Crat.* § 161). Ibid.: *kom preivatud aktud* = *cum privato actu.* Fest. p. 17: "*Actus* in geometria minorem partem jugeri, id est centumviginti pedum." Niebuhr, *Hist. of Rom.* II. *append.* i. *ad not.* 29: "The *jugerum,* as the very name implies, was a double measure; and the real unit in the Roman land-measure

was the *actus*, containing 14,400 square feet, that is, a square of which each side was 120 feet."

L. 16: *pruter pam = præter-quam.*

LL. 18, sqq.: *pon kenstur Bansæ tautam kensazet pis keus Bantins fust kensamur esuf in eituam poizad ligud aisk kenstur kensaum anget uzet aut suæ pis kenstomen nei kebnust dolud mallud in eizeik vinkter esuf comenei lamatir prmeddixud toutad præsentid perum dolum mallum in amirikatud allo famelo in ei sivom paei eizeis fust pae ancensto fust toutiko estud.* The first words are tolerably clear: *Quum censor* (here *censitor*) *Bantiæ civitatem censassit, quis civis Bantinus fuerit.* The letter *z* represents the combination *ss*, as has been shown above by a comparison of ὄβρυζα, *obrussa*, &c. The form *keus* for *civis* is etymologically interesting. It proves that *-vis* is the termination of the Latin word: consequently *ke-us*, *ci-vis*, is composed of the root *ke* (κεῖ-μαι, &c.), and the pronominal affix *-vi-s*, *-u-s* (see *New Cratylus*, § 257), and the word means "a squatter," or generally "an inhabitant;" compare θῆτες, *insassen*, &c. (Buttmann, *Lexil.* II. 111, note). The word *kensamur*, if it is one word, is hardly intelligible. Grotefend understands it as the passive participle *kensamus* for *kensamnus* or *censendus;* but although the participial termination *mn* is often reduced to *n*, I know no instance in which it is represented by *m* only. As we must expect here a passive imperative, it seems most reasonable to conclude that *kensamur* is a corruption for *kensatur = censetor.* A different explanation, but to the same effect, has been proposed by Curtius (*Zeitschr. f. d. Alterthw.* 1849, p. 346). It is remarkable that the verb is conjugated in *-ao*, and not like its Latin equivalent in *-eo.* The conjugation seems to be *censo, -as, -ui, -āum, -itus*, like *veto.* In the next words we have a form *uzet*, which seems to be a parallel to *anget;* and this, as is shown above, means *adiget.* But it would be difficult to explain such a form as *uzo.* Aufrecht (*Zeitschr. f. Vergl. Sprf.* I. 189), reads *angetuzet* as one word, which, however, he does not explain. Now *-tuset* occurs in the *Cippus Abellanus*, ll. 16—39, as an affix to verb-forms: *pruf-tuset, tribarakat-tuset;* and even in Etruscan: *hareu-tuse* (*Cipp. Perus.* 24); and I should explain these agglutinate words as parallel to the Latin *venum-do, cre-do*, considering *tu-* as

identical with *do*. If so, *angetuzet* will mean *adactum dabit* or *adigesset*. *Esu-f* seems to correspond exactly to *i-bi*, just as *pu-f* (*Tab. Pomp.* XXIV. 4, 3) answers to *u-bi*. For *poizad* Aufrecht (u. s.) suggests *pam eizad*. If *poizad* is to stand, it must be a subjunctive corresponding to *penset*, a form of *pendo*. The analogy is supported by the French *poids* for *pondus*, &c. *Ligud aiske = lege hac*, just as below, l. 25. *eś aisken ligis* must mean *ex hisce legibus*. It is hardly possible to understand *kenstom . en .* except as an abbreviation of the two words *censtom enom*, the latter being the same pronoun which appears in Latin, in the locative case, as the conjunction *enim*, Sanscrit *êna* (*New Crat.* § 170). Grotefend's supposition that it is a noun in *-men*, like the Umbrian *esunumen*, is inadmissible, because in that case the word must have been *censamen*. Mommsen (p. 269) suggests an affixed particle = *in*, so that *Kenstom-en = in censum*. This, to say the least, requires to be supported by examples. The verb *kebnust = kebnuerit* is a very difficult word. Mommsen (p. 269) proposes to connect it with the Gothic *quiman* "to come," so that *kebnust = cbenust*. Aufrecht, who justly objects to this etymology (u. s. p. 190), suggests a connexion with the Sanscrit *çap = jurare*. It appears to me that the first syllable is the root of *cap-ut*, κεφ-άλη, *haupt*, &c.; so that *keb-nuo* would be equivalent to καταν*εύ*ω, "to assent to," or, if this is required, "to affirm" on oath. This interpretation of *kebnust* is of course conjectural only; and in a matter of so much uncertainty it is better to leave it as it is. Of the next words we cannot make much. *Toutad præsentid = populo præsente? Amirikatud = immercato* (Kirchhoff, *Zeitschr. f. Vergl. Sprf.* I. 37). We know from Festus that *famel* was an Oscan word, and *famelo* appears by the context to be a feminine derivative from it, signifying *familia* (cf. *egmo*, abl. *egmad*). *Allo* can only be a demonstrative adjective containing the same root as *al-ter*, *al-ius*, *ollus*, &c. And thus the main predication will be *amiricatud allo famelo tontiko estud*, i. e. *immercato* q. d. *sine emptione, illa familia publica esto*. The intervening words are not easily dealt with, and *ineisiuom* can only be rendered conjecturally: but the general meaning of ll. 21—23, clearly is: *aut si quis censum non juraverit dolo malo et illud convincitur, ibi in publico queratur promagistratu populo præsente propter dolum malum; et sine*

emptione illa familia (*perinde atque ejus fuerit qua incensa fuerit*) *publica esto.*

L. 23: *Pr suæ præfukus pod post eśak Bansæ fust:* i. e. *prætor sive præfectus, quando post-hac Bantiæ fuerit. Præfucus* is formed from *præficio*, in the same way as the Umbrian *der-secus* from *dis-seco.* LL. 23, sqq.: *suæ pis op-eizois kom altrud ligud akum herest, auti prumedikatud manim-aserum eizazunk egmazum pas eś aisken ligis skriftas set ne phim pruhipid mais zikolois* x *nesimois*, &c.: i. e. *si quis ob hæc cum altero lege agere voluerit, aut pro magistratu manum conserere propter eas res, quas ex hisce legibus scriptas sciet, ne in hoc præhibeat plus sicilicis decem contiguis* (below, Chap. VII. § 6), &c. The Table has *ne . phim;* I would rather read *nep him: nep* occurs for *neque* in the *Cippus Abellanus*, ll. 46, 47, and is used in an absolute prohibition in Umbrian (*Tab. Eug.* VI. a, 27); and *him* appears to be the locative of the pronoun *hi* (see *New Crat.* § 139). The rest of the paragraph has been explained before.

There is nothing in the last paragraph which seems to require any observation, except that in l. 29 tribunes of the *plebs* seem to be mentioned: *tr. pl. ni fuid = nisi fuit tribunus plebei.*

§ 5. *The Cippus Abellanus.*

Next to the *Tabula Bantina* the most important monument of the Oscan language is a stone tablet called the *Cippus Abellanus*, which was moved from *Avella Vecchia*[1] to the modern village of that name in 1685, and there employed as a door-step, until in 1745 it was remarked by Remondini, then professor in the Episcopal Seminary at Nola, and by him removed to the Museum in that seminary about 1750. The subject of the inscription is an agreement between the neighbouring Campanian cities, Abella and Nola. It will be sufficient to give the inscription with an approximate and in part conjectural translation, which is in great measure due to Theodore Mommsen.

---

[1] The old *Abella*, or *Avella*, was probably *Aberla = aperula = Eberstadt;* cf. *Atella = aderla = aterula = Schwarzburg* (Corssen, *Zeitschr. f. Vergl. Sprf.* 1852, p. 17).

Maiioí . vestirikiioí . mai sir	Magio Vestricieio Magii fil.
prupukid . sverruneí . kvaíst[u]	... Serroni quæsto-
reí . abellanoí . íním . maiio[í]	ri Abellano, et Magio
jovkiioí . mai . pukalatoí	Jovicieio Magii fil. Pucalato
5. medíkeí . deketasioí . novla	magistratui dictario Nola-
[noí í]ním . lígatoís . abellan [oís]	no et legatis Abellanis
íním lígatoís novlanoís	et legatis Nolanis,
pos senate[í]s tanginod	qui senatus jussu
suveís potorospíd lígat[os]	sui utrique legati
10. fufans . ekss . kombened	fuerunt, hoc convenit.
sakaraklom . herekleís	Sacellum Herculis
slaagid . pod . íst . íním teer[om]	in agro quod est et terra
pod . op . eísod . sakaraklod[íst]	quæ apud id sacellum est,
pod . anter . teremníss . eh[trad.]	quæ inter terminos extra
15. íst . paí . teremennio . mo[íníkad]	est, quæ terminatio communi
tanginod . prof . tuset . r[ehtod.]	jussu probabitur justâ
amnod . puv . ídík . sakara-[klom]	causâ aliquâ, id sacellum
íním . ídík . terom . moíní[kom]	et ea terra communis
moíníkeí . tereí . fusíd [aut.]	in communi terra erit. At
20. eíseís . sakarakleís . í[ním]	ejus sacelli et
tereís . fruktatiuf . fr[ukta] [tios] . moíníko . poturu[mpíd].	terræ in messe mes- sio communis utrorumque
[fus]id . aut . novlanu[...] herekleís . fí[	erit. At Nolanorum ...Herculis fanum que Nolans ibi est
25. ...] iispíd . novlan[ipu...ist . . .	
. . . . .	. . . . .
. . . . .	. . . . .
. . . . .	. . . . .
. . . . .	. . . . .
. . . . .	. . . . .
. . . . .	. . . . .
ekkum	Item [si volent agrum
trííbaraka	parti[ri qui ager]
liímíto...term	limitatus [post] term[inos, ubi]
30. herekleís . fíísnu . mefe .	Herculis fanum medium
íst . ehtrad . feíhoss . pu[s]	est, extra antefixa, quæ
herekleís . fíísnam . amfr	Herculis fanum amb-

et . pert . víam . posstít
paí . íp . íst . postin. slagím.
35. senateís . suveís . tangi
nod . tríbarakavum . lí
kítud . íním . íok . tríba
rakkiuf . pam . novlanos .
tríbarakattuset . íním
40. oíttiuf . novlanum . estud
ekkum . svaí . píd . abellanos
tríbarakattuset . íok . trí
barakkiuf . íním . oíttiuf .
abellanum . estud . aut
45. post . feíhoís . pos . físnam . am
fret . eíseí . tereí . nep . abel-
lanos . nep . novlanos . pídum
tríbarakattíns . aut . the
saurom . pod . eseí . tereí . íst
50. pon . patensíns . moíníkad .
ta[n]
ginod . patensíns . íním píd
e[seí]
thesaureí . pukkapid . eh[trad]
[o]íttíom . alttram . alttr[
]erríns . aut . anter slag[ím]
55. [a]bellanam . íním . novlanam
[p]ollad . vío . uruvo . íst . tedur
[e]ísaí . víaí . mefiaí . tereme[n]
[n]iu staíet .

iunt, ad viam usque positus est,
qui ibi est positus, agrum
senatus sui jus-
su partiri li-
ceto ; et is partiti-
one quam Nolanus (senatus)
partietur et
usui Nolanorum esto.
Item si quid Abellanus (senatus)
partietur, is (ager) par-
titione et usu
Abellanorum esto. At
post antefixa quæ fanum am-
biunt, in ea terra neque Abel-
lanus neque Nolanus quidquam
partiantur. At the-
saurum qui in ea terrâ est
quum aperiunt, communi jus-
su aperiant, et quidquid in eo
thesauro quandocunque extra
usum alterum-alterius
habeant. At inter agrum
Abellanum et Nolanum
quacunque via curva est, ibi
in ea via media termina-
tio stet.

On the forms which occur in this inscription it is not necessary to say much. *Slagis*, which occurs in the accus. and abl. sing., seems to contain the root of *locus* (*stlocus*), *lac-una*, *loch*, &c. *Prof-tuset*, *tribarakat-tuset*, *tribarakat-tins*, are agglutinate forms like *venum-do*, *cre-do*, &c. The adjunct *tu-* is probably equivalent to *do*, signifying "to make, or put." Thus *prof-tuset* = *probatum dabit* = *probabitur* (see above, on *Tab. Bant.* l. 20). *Físna* comes from *fes-* or *fas-*, as in *fes-cenninus*, *fas-cinum*. *Feihos* contains the root of *figo*. And *tedur* is a pronominal adverb corresponding in form and meaning to the old use of *igitur*.

§ 6. *The Bronze Tablet of Agnone.*

The most recent contribution to our knowledge of the Oscan language is furnished by a small bronze tablet, which was discovered at Fonte di Romito, between Capracotta and Agnone, in the year 1848. As the place of discovery is near the river Sagrus or Sangro, this inscription may be regarded as exhibiting the most northerly as the Bantine table exhibits the most southerly dialect of the Samnite language. It is obvious, on the slightest inspection, that the table speaks of a series of dedications to different deities or heroes, who are enumerated in the dative case. Accordingly, it is not likely to add much to the general vocabulary of the Sabello-Oscan idioms. Its interpretation has been attempted by Henzen (*Annali dell' Instituto Archeol.* 1848, pp. 382—414), Mommsen (*ibid.* pp. 414—429. *unterital. Dialekte*, pp. 128, sqq.), Aufrecht (*Zeitschrift f. Vergl. Sprf.* I. pp. 86, sqq.), and Knötel (*Zeitschr. f. d. Alterthumsw.* 1850. no. 52, 53, 1852. no. 16, 17), who are by no means in agreement respecting the proper names or ordinary words which it includes. The interpretation, which I have placed by the side of the text, is indebted in most points to some or other of my predecessors.

Face.

status . pus . set . hortín .	Consecratio quæ sit horto
kerríiín : vezkeí . statíf .	geniali. Vesco stative,
evkloí . statíf . kerrí . statíf .	Libero st., Cero st.,
futreí . kerríiaí . statíf .	Cereri geniali st.,
5. anter . statoí . statíf .	Interstitæ st.,
ammaí . kerríiaí . statíf .	Matri geniali st.,
diumpaís . kerríiaís . statíf .	Lymphis genialibus st.,
líganakdíkeí . entraí . statíf .	Leganecdici immotæ st.,
anafríss . kerríioís . statíf .	Ambarvalibus genialibus st.,
10. maatoís . kerríioís . statíf .	Matutis genialibus st.,
dioveí . verehasioí . statíf .	Jovi almo st.,
dioveí . regatureí . statíf .	Jovi pluvio st.,
herekloí . kerríioí . statíf .	Herculi geniali st.,
patanaí . piístíaí statíf .	Pandæ pistrici st.,
15. deívaí . genetaí . statíf .	Divæ genetæ st.,
aasaí . purasiaí .	Aræ puræ ;
saahtom . teforom . alltreí .	sacrum tepidum alter-
potereípíd . akeneí .	utro anno

sakahíter .	sacratur.
20. fluusasiaís . az . hortom	Floralibus ad hortum
sakarater	sacrificatur ;
pernaí . kerríiaí . statíf .	Pali geniali stative,
ammaí . kerríiaí . statíf .	Matri geniali st.,
flussaí . kerríiai . statíf .	Floræ geniali st.,
25. evkloi . patereí . statíf .	Libero patri st..
Back.	
aasas . ekask . eestínt	Aræ hæ exstent
hortoí	horto :
vezkeí	Vesco,
evkloí	Libero,
5. fuutreí	Cereri,
anter . stataí .	Interstitæ,
kerrí	Genio,
ammaí	Matri,
diumpaís	Lymphis,
10. liganakdíkeí . entraí .	Leganecdici immotæ
kerríiaí .	geniali,
anafriss .	Ambarvalibus,
maatoís .	Matutis,
dioveí . verehasio	Jovi almo,
15. dioveí . piíhioí . regatureí .	Jovi pio pluvio,
herekloí . kerríioí .	Herculi geniali,
patanaí piístiaí .	Pandæ pistrici,
deívaí . genetaí .	Divæ genetæ,
aasaí . purasiaí .	Aræ puræ ;
20. saahtom . teforom .	sacrum tepidum
alttreí potereípíd	alterutro
akeneí .	anno ;
horz . dekmannioís staít .	hortus in decumanis stet.

The substantive *kerus* and its possessive *kereias* must be explained with reference to the root *cer-*, *cre-* (*creare*), Sanscr. *kri*, "to make," which we find in *Ceres* and *Cerus* = *creator*, Festus, p. 122. To the same class of deities belongs *Futris* (root *φυ-*, *fu*), and it is a matter of indifference whether *Venus* or *Ceres* comes nearest to the goddess intended. Knötel identifies *Evklus* with *Iphiclus*, and of course this is possible; but the adjunct *patri* in l. 25, seems to denote a deity analogous to *Liber Pater* (cf. *Evius*). *Amma* corresponds, as Aufrecht suggests, to the Germ. *amme*, Sanscr. *ambâ*, "mother." *Verehasius*, as an

epithet of Jupiter, is explained by the Sanscr. *vṛi*, "to grow," whence the Latin *virga;* and *regator* must be *rigator*, i. e. *pluvius*. *Patana* is *Panda* or *Patella* (Gell. XIII. 22. Arnob. IV. 7), who opens the husk of the grain. *Teforom* answers to the Latin *tepidus*, and still more nearly to the Etruscan *tephral* (see above, Chap. II. § 11). *Akenus* is = *annus*, as in Umbrian (see Aufrecht u. Kirchhoff, *Umbr. Sprd.* p. 401). *Perna* is *Pales* = *Pares* (v. Festus, p. 222, Müller; and cf. *vetus, veter-nus, lux, luci-na, dies, dia-nus, jov-is, ju-no,* &c.). We may compare *pistia* with *pistor, pistum, pisum,* &c.

§ 7. *The Atellanæ.*

It seems scarcely worth while to enumerate the grammatical forms which may be collected from these inscriptions, as they are virtually the same with those which occur in the oldest specimens of Latin, the only important differences being that we have *-azum* for *-arum* in the gen. pl. of the 1st decl., that the 3rd declension sometimes preserves the original *-ss* of the nom. pl., and that this reduplication represents the absorbed *m* in the acc. pl. of the 2nd and 3rd declensions. It may be desirable, however, before concluding this part of the subject, to make a few remarks on the *Fabulæ Atellanæ*, the only branch of Oscan literature of which we know any thing.

The most important passage respecting the *Fabulæ Atellanæ*,—that in which Livy is speaking (VII. 2) of the introduction of the Tuscan *ludiones* at Rome in the year A.U.C. 390,—has often been misunderstood; and the same has been the fate of a passage in Tacitus (IV. 14), in which the historian mentions the expulsion of the actors from Italy in the year A. U. C. 776. With regard to the latter, Tacitus has caused some confusion by his inaccurate use of the word *histrio;* but Suetonius has the phrase *Atellanarum histrio* (*Nero*, c. 39); and the word had either lost its earlier and more limited signification, or the Atellanæ were then performed by regular *histriones*.

Livy says that, among other means of appeasing the anger of the gods in the pestilence of 390 A. U. C., scenic games were for the first time introduced at Rome. Hitherto the Romans had had no public sports except those of the circus—namely, races and wrestling; but now this trivial and foreign amusement was introduced. Etruscan *ludiones* danced gracefully to the sound of the flute without any accompaniment of words, and without

any professed mimic action. Afterwards, the Roman youth began to imitate these dances, and accompanied them with unpremeditated jests, after the manner of the Fescennine verses; these effusions gave way to the *satura*, written in verse and set to the flute, which was acted by professed *histriones* with suitable songs and gestures; and then, after a lapse of several years, Livius Andronicus ventured to convert the *satura* into a regular poem, and to make a distinction between the singing (*canticum*) and the dialogue (*diverbia*); the latter alone being reserved to the *histriones*, and the former being a monologue, by way of interlude with a flute accompaniment[1]. Upon this, the Roman youth, leaving the regular play to the professed actors, revived the old farces, and acted them as interludes or afterpieces (*exodia*[2]) to the regular drama. These farces, he expressly says, were of Oscan origin, and akin to the *Fabulæ Atellanæ*; and they had the peculiar advantage of not affecting the civic rights of the actors.

In order to understand the ancient respectability of the *Atellanæ*, we must bear in mind the opposition which is always recognized between them and the Mime. Hermann has proposed the following parallel classification of the Greek and Roman plays (*Opusc.* V. p. 260, cf. Diomedes, III. p. 480, Putsch):

GRÆCUM ARGUMENTUM.	ROMANUM ARGUMENTUM.
Crepidata (τραγῳδία).	*Prætextata.*
Palliata (κωμῳδία).	*Togata*, vel *trabeata* vel *tabernaria.*
Satyrica (σάτυροι).	*Atellana.*
Mimus (μῖμος).	*Planipes.*

[1] Diomed. III. p. 489: "in canticis una tantum debet esse persona, aut, si duæ fuerint, ita debent esse, ut ex occulto una audiat, nec colloquatur, sed secum, si opus fuerit, verba faciat." On the *canticum* see Hermann, *Opusc.* I. pp. 290, sqq., who has clearly shown that it was not merely a flute voluntary between the acts.

[2] As the practice of the Greek and Roman stage involved the performance of several dramas on the same day, it matters little whether we render *exodium* by "interlude" or "afterpiece." According to the definitions given by Suidas and Hesychius, an *exodium* was that which followed an *exeunt omnes*, whether, which was more common, at the end of a play, or at the end of an act. See the examples given by Meineke on Cratinus, *Fr. Incert.* CLXX. p. 230, and compare Baumstark's article in Pauly's *Real-Encycl.* III. p. 360.

Adopting this classification, which has at least much to recommend it, we shall see that as the Greek satyrical drama was the original form of the entertainment, and, though jocose, was not without its elevating and religious element, so the *Atellana*, as a national drama, was immediately connected with the festive worship of the people in which it took its rise, and therefore retained a respectability which could not be conceded to the performances of foreign *histriones*. These artists were not allowed to pollute[1] the domestic drama; and, being free from all contact with the professional actor, the young Roman could appear in the Atellan play without any forfeiture of his social position. Whereas, even in the corrupt days of the later empire, Juvenal saw something especially monstrous in the fact that a noble could appear as a *mimus* or *planipes*[2]. With particular reference to the contrast between the *mimus* and the Atellana, Cicero says to Papirius Pætus, who had introduced some vulgar jokes after a quotation from the Œnomaus of Accius, that he had followed the modern custom of giving a mime for afterpiece instead of adopting the old practice of introducing the Atellan farce after the tragedy[3]. In the same way he says[4] that superfluous imitation, such as obscene gestures, belongs to the domain of those *mimi*, who caricatured the manners of men. And while Macrobius considers it as an exceptional merit to have introduced *mimi* without lasciviousness[5], Valerius Maximus

---

[1] Liv. VII. 2: "nec ab histrionibus *pollui* passa est."

[2] VIII. 189, sqq.:

"populi frons durior hujus,
Qui sedet, et spectat triscurria patriciorum,
Planipedes audit Fabios, ridere potest qui
Mamercorum alapas."

[3] Cic. *ad Div.* IX. 16, 2: "nunc venio ad jocationes tuas, quum tu secundum Œnomaum Accii, non, ut olim solebat, *Atellanam*, sed, ut nunc fit, *mimum* introduxisti."

[4] *de Oratore*, II. 59: "*mimorum* est enim *ethologorum*, si nimia est imitatio, sicut obscœnitas." Cf. c. 60, § 244.

[5] Saturn. II. 7: "videbimur et adhibendo convivio mimos vitasse *lasciviam*." This is the passage referred to by Manutius in his note on Cicero *ad Div.* IX. 16, 2, where he says in a parenthesis: "itaque Macrobius Lib. III. Saturn. mimis lasciviam tribuit." In Smith's *Dict. of Antiquities*, Art. *Atellanæ fabulæ*, Ed. I., this note of Manutius is paraded at full length as a quotation from "Macrobius *Satur.* Lib. III.," and even

attributes the social respectability of those who performed in the Atellan farces to the old Italian gravity which tempered this entertainment[1].

But besides the moral decency by which the Atellana was distinguished from the mime, it is manifest from the passage in Livy that it derived additional recommendation from the fact that this was a national amusement and was connected with the usages of the country population, who always contributed a varying proportion to the inhabitants of ancient Rome. We infer from the words of the historian that the Roman youth were not satisfied with either the Tuscan or the Greek importations, and that it was their wish to revive something that was not foreign, but national. Of course Livy cannot mean to say that the Oscan farce was not introduced at Rome till after the time of Livius Andronicus Muso, and that it was then imported from *Atella*. For whereas Muso did not perform at Rome till the second Punic war[2], Atella shared in the fate of Capua ten years before the battle of Zama, and the inhabitants were compelled to migrate

---

the *ut arbitror* of the commentator is made to express the opinions of the author quoted. It is evident that the compiler of this Article made no attempt to verify the reference to Macrobius, which he has used without stating that he was indebted for it to Manutius, and which he has carefully placed at a distance from his reference to Cicero. His blunder is the just *Nemesis* of his dishonesty. As he quotes from Valerius Maximus, "II. 1," instead of "II. 4," we may presume that in this case also he is using the learning of some commentator. In the new edition of Smith's *Dictionary* the article *Atellanæ Fabulæ* is suppressed, and a short account of the subject is included in the article *Comœdia*, written by another person. The same *Nemesis* still tracks the dishonest quotation, for there "Macrobius, *Satur.* III." is quoted for Manutius' statement that the *Atellana* was divided into five acts. All this may be taken as an example of the false affectation of learning on the part of the compilers, and general incompetence on the part of the editor, which is so frequently conspicuous in Smith's *dictionaries*.

[1] II. 4: "Atellani autem ab Oscis acciti sunt; quod genus delectationis Italica severitate temperatum, ideoque vacuum nota est; nam neque tribu movetur, neque a militaribus stipendiis repellitur."

[2] Porcius Licinius, *apud Aul. Gell.* XVII. 21:

> *Pœnico bello secundo* Muso pinnato gradu
> Intulit se bellicosam in Romuli gentem feram.

See also Hor. II. *Epist.* I. 162.

to Calatia[1]. Now it appears from the coins of this place that its Oscan name was *Aderla*[2]; and the Romans always pronounced this as Atella, by a change of the medial into a tenuis, as in *Mettus* for *Meddix*, *imperator* for *embratur*, *fuit* for *fuid*, &c. This shows that the name was in early use at Rome; and we may suppose that, as an essential element in the population of Rome was Oscan, the Romans had their Oscan farces from a very early period, and that these farces received a great improvement from the then celebrated city of *Aderla* in Campania. It is also more than probable that these Oscan farces were common in the country life of the old Romans, both before they were introduced into the city[3], and after the expulsion of the *histriones* by Tiberius[4]. For the mask was the peculiar characteristic of the Atellanæ[5], and these country farces are always spoken of with especial reference to the masks of the actors.

We may be sure that the Oscan language was not used in these farces when that language ceased to be intelligible to the Romans. The language of the fragments which have come down to us is pure Latin[6], and Tacitus describes the Atellana as "Oscum *quondam* ludicrum[7]." Probably, till a comparatively late period,

---

[1] Livy, XXVI. 16, XXII. 61, XXVII. 3.

[2] Lepsius *ad Inscriptiones*, p. 111. For the meaning of the word, see above, § 5, note.

[3] Virgil. *Georg.* II. 385, sqq.:

> Nec non Ausonii, Troja gens missa, coloni
> Versibus incomptis ludunt risuque soluto,
> Oraque corticibus sumunt horrenda cavatis.

Comp. Horat. II. *Epist.* I. 139, sqq.

[4] Juvenal, *Sat.* III. 172, sqq.:

> Ipsa dierum
> Festorum herboso colitur si quando theatro
> Majestas, tandemque redit ad pulpita notum
> Exodium, quum personæ pallentis hiatum
> In gremio matris formidat rusticus infans.

That the *exodium* here refers to the *Atellana* appears from Juv. VI. 71:

> "Urbicus *exodio* risum movet *Atellanæ*
> Gestibus Autonoes."

[5] Festus, s. v. *personata fabula*, p. 217: "per Atellanos *qui proprie vocantur personati*." The modern representatives of the Atellan characters are still called *maschere*, and our harlequin always appears with a black mask on the upper part of his face.

[6] See Diomed. III. pp. 487, 488, Putsch. [7] *Ann.* IV. 149.

the Atellana abounded in provincial and rustic expressions[1]; but at last it retained no trace of its primitive simplicity, for the gross coarseness and obscenity[2], which seem to have superseded the old-fashioned elegance of the original farce[3], and brought it into a close resemblance to the *mimus*, from which it was originally distinguished, must be attributed to the general corruption of manners under the emperors, and perhaps also to the fact that from the time of Sulla downwards the Oscan farce was gradually passing from its original form into that of a regular play on the Greek model, so that all the faults of Greek comedy would eventually find a place in the entertainment. The principal writers of the Latin Atellanæ, after Sulla, who is said to have used his own, that is, the Campanian dialect[4], were Q. Novius[5], L. Pomponius Bononiensis[6], L. Afranius[7], and C. Memmius[8]. The political allusions with which they occasionally abounded, and which in the opinion of Tiberius called for the interference of the senate[9], were a feature borrowed from the licence of the old Greek comedy; and to the same source we must refer the names of the personages[10], which are known to have been adopted by Novius, Afranius, and Pomponius, and which

---

[1] Varro, *L. L.* VII. § 84, p. 152.

[2] Terent. *Maur.* p. 2436, Putsch; Quintil. *Inst. Or.* VI. 3; Tertull. *De Spectaculis*, 18; Schober, *über die Atellan. Schauspiele*, pp. 28, sqq.

[3] Donat. *de Trag. et Com.* "Atellanæ salibus et jocis compositæ, quæ in se non habent nisi *vetustam elegantiam.*"

[4] Athenæus, IV. p. 261, c.: ἐμφανίζουσι δ' αὐτοῦ τὸ περὶ ταῦτα ἱλαρὸν αἱ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γραφεῖσαι Σατυρικαὶ κωμῳδίαι τῇ πατρίῳ φονῇ. That the satyric comedies here referred to must have been *Atellanæ* may be inferred from Diomedes, III. p. 487, Putsch: "tertia species est fabularum Latinarum, quæ . . . *Atellanæ* dictæ sunt, argumentis dictisque jocularibus similes *satyricis* fabulis Græcis." The reference to the *Simus* in the *Atellanæ* (Sueton. *Galb.* 15) points to a contact with the satyrs. Macrobius, *Saturn.* II. 1.

[5] Aulus Gellius, *N. A.* XVII. 2.

[6] Macrob. *Saturn.* VII. 9; Fronto ad M. Cæs. IV. 3, p. 95, Mai; Velleius, II. 9, 6.

[7] Nonius, s. v. *ientare.* [8] Macrobius, *Saturn.* I. 10.

[9] Tacitus, *Annal.* IV. 14: "Oscum quondam ludicrum, levissimæ apud vulgus delectationis, eo flagitiorum et virium venisse, ut auctoritate patrum coercendum sit." Cf. Sueton. *Nero*, c. 39; *Galba*, c. 13; *Calig.* c. 27; where we have special instances of the political allusions in the later *Atellanæ.*

[10] See Müller, *Hist. Lit. Gr.* ch. XXIX. § 5. Vol. II. p. 43, note.

are either Greek in themselves or translations of Greek words. The old gentleman or pantaloon was called *Pappus* or *Casnar*: the former was the Greek Πάππος, the latter, as we have seen, was an Oscan term = *vetus*. The clown or chatterbox was called *Bucco*, from *bucca*, and was thus a representative of the Greek Γνάθων. The glutton *Macco*, Greek Μάκκω, has left a trace of his name in the Neapolitan *Maccaroni*; and *Punch* or *Polichinello* is derived from the endearing diminutive *Pulchellus*, which, like the Greek Καλλίας, was used to denote apes and puppets[1]. The *Sannio* is the σάννας of Cratinus (*Fr. Incert.* XXXIII. a. p. 187, Meineke); and this buffoon with his patchwork dress is represented by the modern Harlequin, one of whose names is still *zanni*, Angl. "zany." The modern word *harlequin* is merely the Italian *allecchino*, i. e. "gourmand." Menage's dream about the comedian, who was so called in the reign of Henry III. because he frequented the house of M. de Harlai, is only an amusing example of that which was called etymology not many years ago.

On the whole we must conclude, that the Atellan farces were ultimately Grecized, like all the literature of ancient Italy, and as the language of the Doric chorus grew more and more identical with that of the Attic dialogue, to which it served as an interlude, so this once Oscan *exodium* was assimilated in language and character to the histrionic plays, to which it served as an afterpiece, and so gradually lost its national character and social respectability. Thus we find in the destiny of this branch of Oscan literature an example of the absorbing centralization of Rome, which, spreading its metropolitan Latinity over the provinces, eventually annihilated, or incorporated and blended with its civic elements, all the distinctive peculiarities of the allied or subject population.

---

[1] *Theatre of the Greeks*, Ed. 6, p. [160].

CHAPTER V.

THE ETRUSCAN LANGUAGE.

§ 1. Transcriptions of proper names the first clue to an interpretation of the Etruscan language. § 2. Names of Etruscan divinities derived and explained. § 3. Alphabetical list of Etruscan words interpreted. § 4. Etruscan inscriptions—difficulties attending their interpretation. § 5. Inscriptions in which the Pelasgian element predominates. § 6. Transition to the inscriptions which contain Scandinavian words—The laurel-crowned Apollo—Explanation of the words *clan* and *phleres*. § 7. Inscriptions containing the words *suthi* and *tree*. § 8. Inferences derivable from the words *sver*, *cver*, and *thur* or *thaur*. § 9. Striking coincidence between the Etruscan and Old Norse in the use of the auxiliary verb *lata*. § 10. The great Perugian Inscription critically examined. Its Runic affinities. § 11. Harmony between linguistic research and ethnographic tradition in regard to the ancient Etruscans. § 12. General remarks on the absorption or evanescence of the old Etruscan language.

§ 1. *Transcriptions of proper names the first clue to an interpretation of the Etruscan language.*

IT will not be possible to investigate the remains of the Etruscan language with any reasonable prospect of complete success, until some scholar shall have furnished us with a body of inscriptions resting on a critical examination of the originals[1]; and even then it is doubtful if we should have a sufficiently copious collection of materials. The theory, however, that the Etruscan language, as we have it, is in part a Pelasgian idiom, more or less corrupted and deformed by contact with the Umbrian, and in part a relic of the oldest Low-German or Scandinavian dialects, is amply confirmed by an inspection of those remains which admit of approximate interpretation.

The first clue to the understanding of this mysterious language is furnished by the Etruscan transcriptions of well-known Greek proper names, and by the Etruscan forms of those names which were afterwards adopted by the Romans. This comparison may at least supply some *prima-facie* evidence of the peculiari-

---

[1] The first impulse to the study of Etruscan antiquities was given by the posthumous publication of Dempster's work *de Etruria Regali*, which was finished in 1619, and edited by Coke in 1723—4. Bonarota, who furnished the accurate illustrations of this work, insists upon the importance of a correct transcription of the existing linguistic materials.

ties of Tuscan articulation, and of the manner in which the language tended to corrupt itself.

It is well known that the Etruscan alphabet possessed no *mediæ*, as they are called. We are not, therefore, surprised to find, that in their transcriptions of Greek proper names the Etruscans have substituted *tenues*[1]. Thus, the Greek names, Ἄδραστος, Τυδεύς, Ὀδυσσεύς, Μελέαγρος, and Πολυδεύκης, are written *Atresthe, Tute, Utuze, Melakre,* and *Pultuke.* But the change in the transcription goes a step farther than this; for, though they actually possessed the *tenues*, they often convert them into *aspiratæ.* Thus, Ἀγαμέμνων, Ἄδραστος, Θέτις, Περσεύς, Πολυνείκης, Τήλεφος, become *Achmiem, Atresthe, Thethis, Pherse, Phulnike, Thelaphe.* In some cases the Greek *tenues* remain unaltered in the transcription, as in Πηλεύς, *Pele;* Παρθενοπαῖος, *Parthanapæ;* Κάστωρ, *Kastur;* Ἡρακλῆς, *Herkle:* and the Greek *aspiratæ* are also transferred, as in Ἀμφιάραος, *Amphiare.* These transcriptions of Greek names supply us also with a very important fact in regard to the Etruscan syllabarium: namely, that their liquids were really semivowels; in other words, that these letters did not require the expression of an articulation-vowel. It has been shown elsewhere[2] that the semi-vocal nature of the liquid is indicated in

---

[1] With regard to the Etruscan alphabet in general, it may be said that it did not come directly from the East, but from the intermediate settlements of the Pelasgian race. When Müller says (*Etrusk.* II. 290) that it was derived from Greece, he cannot mean that it passed over into Italy subsequently to the commencement of Hellenic civilization. The mere fact that the writing was from right to left, shows that the Etruscans derived their letters from the other peninsula, while its inhabitants were still Pelasgian; for there are very few, even of the earliest Greek inscriptions which retain the original direction of the writing (see *New Crat.* § 101; Müller, *Etrusk.* II. p. 309). At the same time, the existence of hexameter verse in Etruria and other circumstances show that there was a continued intercourse between the Pelasgo-Etruscans and the Greeks (Müller, ibid. p. 292). On the Pelasgic origin of the Etruscan alphabet, the reader may consult the authorities quoted by Lepsius, *de Tabb. Eug.* p. 29.

[2] *New Crat.* § 107. The word *el-em-en-tum,* according to the etymology which has received the sanction of Heindorf (*ad Hor.* I. *Sat.* I. 26), would furnish an additional confirmation of these views. But this etymology cannot be admitted; and the word must be considered as containing the root *ol-* (in *olere, adolescens, indoles, soboles, prôles,* &c.), so that

most languages by the etymological fact, that it may be articulated by a vowel either preceding or following it. For example: mute + liquid + vowel = mute + vowel + liquid, is an equation which holds good in every etymological problem. Applying this principle to the Etruscan transcriptions, we see that the Etruscan *Ap[u]lu, Ach[i]le, At[a]laent, Erc[u]le, El[e]chs[a]ntre, Men[e]le, M[e]n[e]rva, Phul[u]nices, Ur[e]ste,* &c. are representatives of the Greek Ἀπόλλων, Ἀχιλλεύς, Ἀταλάντη, Ἡρακλῆς, Ἀλέξανδρος, Μενελέως, Πολυνείκης, Ὀρέστης, and of the Latin *Minerva,* only because the Etruscans did not find it necessary to express in writing the articulation-vowels of the liquids. It is interesting to remark that the old poetic dialect of the Icelandic, as distinguished from the modern tongue, exhibits the same peculiarity; thus *r* is always written for *ur,* as in *northr, vethr, akr, vetr, vitr.* There are a few instances of the same brachygraphy in the oldest Greek inscriptions: thus, on Mr. Burgon's vase we have ΑΘΗΝΗΘΝ for Ἀθήνηθεν. Böckh (*C. I.* No. 33) has wrongly read this inscription, which forms three cretics: τῶν Ἀθή|νηθεν ἄ|θλων ἐμί. With regard to the form *Ercle,* for which we have *Hercole* in Dempster, T. I. tab. VI.; Lanzi, II. p. 205. tab. XI. n. 1, it is to be remarked that the short *u* = *o* before *l* appears to be a natural stop-gap in old Italian articulation. Thus we have *Æsculapius* for Αἰσκλήπιος. When we remember that Ἡρακλῆς was the tutelary god of the *Dorians* or *Her-mun-duri,* who conquered the Peloponnese, we can hardly avoid identifying him with *Her-minius.*

If we pass to the consideration of those proper names which are found in the Latin language, we shall observe peculiarities of precisely the same kind. For instance, the medials in *Idus, Tlabonius, Vibius,* &c. are represented in Etruscan by the tenues in *Itus, Tlapuni, Fipi,* &c.; the tenues in *Turius, Velcia,* &c. stand for the aspirates in *Thura, Felche,* &c.; and the articula-

---

ele-mentum = *olementum.* See Benary in the *Berl. Jahrb.* for August 1841, p. 240. As the *ludus,* or gladiatorial school was the earliest specimen of a distinct training establishment, and as it has consequently furnished a name to all schools, so its two functions have similarly descended into the vocabulary of education: for *rudi-menta,* properly the "foil exercises," and *ele-menta,* properly the "training-food," have become synonymous expressions for early education, just as *e-rud-itus,* "out of foils," has become the term for a completely learned man.

tion-vowels in *Licinius, Tanaquil,* &c. are omitted before or after the liquids in *Lecne, Thanchfil,* &c.

The transcription *Utuze,* for Ὀδυσσεύς, suggests a remark which has been in part anticipated in a former chapter. We see that in this case the Etruscan z corresponds to the Greek -σσ, just as conversely, in the cases there cited, the Greek -ζ is represented by *-ss* in Latin. It was formerly supposed that this Etruscan z was equivalent to x = ks, and this supposition was based on a comparison of *Utuze* with *Ulyxes.* To say nothing, however, of the mistake, which was made in assuming that *Utuze* represented *Ulyxes* and not Ὀδυσσεύς, it has been shown by Lepsius (*De Tabb. Eug.* pp. 59, sqq.; *Annali dell' Instituto,* VIII. p. 168) both that the Etruscans added this z to the guttural k, as in *śrankzl,* &c. and also that, when it was necessary to express the Greek ξ, they did not use the letter z, but formed a representative for it by a combination of k or ch with s, as in *Secstinal* = *Sextinia natus,* and *Elchsntre* = Ἀλέξανδρος. Palæographical considerations also indicate that the letter corresponded in form, not to ξ or *x,* but to the Greek *z.* We ought, however, to go a step farther than Lepsius has done, and say that the Latin *x* was, after all, in one of its values, a representative of this Etruscan letter. It is true, indeed, that *x* does represent also the combination of a guttural and sibilant; but there are cases, on the other hand, in which *x* is found in Latin words containing roots into which no guttural enters: comp. *rixa* with ἔρις (ἔριδος), ἐρίζω, &c. In these cases it must be supposed to stand as a representative of the Greek ζ in its sound *sh,* and also of the Hebrew *shin,* from which ξι has derived its name (see *New Crat.* § 115). With regard to the name *Ulysses, Ulyxes,* Ὀδυσσεύς, etymology would rather show that the ultimate form of the *x, ss,* or *z,* was a softened dental. The Tuscan name of this hero was *Nanus,* i. e. "the pygmy" (Müller, *Etrusk.* II. p. 269); and, according to Eustathius (p. 289, 38), Ὀλυσσεύς or Ὀλισσεύς was the original form of the Greek name. From these data it has been happily conjectured (by Kenrick, *Herod.* p. 281) that the name means ὄ-λιζος, ὄ-λισσος, Æol. for ὀ-λίγος (Eustath. 1160, 16), of which the simplest form is λιτός, *little:* so that Ulysses, in the primitive conception, was a god represented in a diminutive form.

§ 2. *Names of Etruscan divinities derived and explained.*

The materials, which are at present available for an approximate philological interpretation of the Tuscan language, may be divided into three classes: (1) the names of deities, &c., whose titles and attributes are familiar to us from the mythology of Greece and Rome; (2) the Tuscan words which have descended to us with an interpretation; and (3) the inscriptions, sepulchral or otherwise, of which we possess accurate transcripts. Let us consider these three in their order.

The Tuscans seem to have worshipped three gods especially as rulers of the sky,—*Janus*, god of the sky in general; *Jupiter*, whom they called *Tina*, god of the day; and *Summanus*, god of the night. Of these, *Janus* and *Tina* are virtually the same designation. The root *dyâ* seems to be appropriated in a great many languages to signify "day" or "daylight." See Grimm, *Deut. Mythol.* 2d ed. p. 177. Sometimes it stands absolutely, as in *dies* = *dia-is*; sometimes it involves *u*, as in the Sanscr. *dyû*, Gr. Ζεύς, Lat. *deus*; sometimes it appears in a secondary form, as in the Hebr. *yôm*, Gr. ἡμέρα; and sometimes it has a dental affix, as in the Gr. Ζήν, Lat. or Tusc. *Janus*. It is sufficiently established that *dj*, *j*, *y*, are different forms of the same articulation, which is also expressed by the Greek ζ. The fem. of *Janus* was *Diana*: *Jupiter* and *Diespiter* were the same word. The Greeks had lost their *j*-sound, except so far as it was implied in ζ; but I have proved elsewhere that the η also contained its ultimate resolution[1]. That *Tina* contains the same root as Ζήν = *Dyan* may be proved by an important Greek analogy. If we compare the Greek interrogative τίς with its Latin equivalent *quis*, admitting, as we must, that they had a common origin, we at once perceive that the Greek form has lost every trace of the labial element of the Latin *qu*, while the guttural is preserved in the softened form τι = *j*. Supposing that *kas* was the proper form of the interrogative after the omission of the labial, then, when *k* was softened into *j* = *di*, as *qu-o-jus* became *cu-jus*, &c., in the same way κ-α-ς would become τίς, the tenuis being preferred to the medial[2]. Just so in the

[1] *New Crat.* § 112.

[2] The crude form of τις is τι-ν- (τι-νος, &c.); in other words, it is a compound of two pronominal elements, like εἷς (= ἑν-ς), κεῖ-νος, τῆ-νος,

Etruscan language, which had no medials, Ζήν = *dian-us* would become *Tina*-[*s*] or *Tinia*-[*s*]. This *Tina* or *Jupiter* of the Tuscans was emphatically the god of light and lightning, and with Juno and Minerva formed a group who were joined together in the special worship of the old Italians. As the Etruscans had no consonant *j*, the name of *Janus* must have been pronounced by them as *Zanus*. This god, whose four-faced statue was brought from Falerii to Rome, indicated the sky, or *templum*, with its four regions. When he appeared as *biceps*, he represented the main regions of the *templum*—the *decumanus* and the *cardo*. And as this augurial reference was intimately connected with the arrangement of the gates in a city or in a camp[1], he became also the god of gates, and his name ultimately signified "a gate" or "archway." *Summanus*, or *Submanus*, was the god of nightly thunders. The usual etymology is *summus manium;* but there is little reason for supposing that it is an ordinary Latin word. As Arnobius considers him identical with Pluto[2], it seems reasonable to conclude that he was simply the

---

ἀ-νά, *e-nim*, *ê-na*, &c. Lobeck asserts (*Paralipom.* p. 121, note) that the *ν* in *τι-ν-ός* is repugnant to all analogy, the *literæ cliticæ* of the Greeks being dentals only,—as if *ν* were not a dental! The absurdity of Lobeck's remarks here, and in many other passages of his later writings, will serve to show how necessary it is that an etymologer should be acquainted with the principles of comparative philology. There are some observations on this subject in the *New Crat.* § 38, which more particularly refer to Lobeck (*Aglaopham.* p. 478, note i.), and to a very inferior man, his pupil Ellendt (*Lex. Sophocl.* præfat. p. iii.). From what Lobeck said in his *Paralipomena* (p. 226, note), one felt disposed to hope that his old-fashioned prejudices were beginning to yield to conviction. In a later work, however (*Pathologia*, præf. pp. vii. sqq.), he reappears in his original character. The *caution* on which he plumes himself ("ego quoque sæpe vel invitus et ingratis eo adactus sum ut vocabulorum origines abditas conjectura quærerem, *cautior fortasse Cratylis nostris*, quorum curiositati nihil clausum, nihil impervium est,") is only another name for one-sided obstinacy; and whatever value we may set upon Lobeck's actual performances in his own field, we cannot concede to him the right of confining all other scholars to the narrow limits of his Hemsterhusian philology.

[1] See below, Ch. VII. § 6.

[2] The Glossar. Labbæi has *Summanus*, Προμηθεύς; and perhaps Prometheus, as the stealer of fire from heaven, may have been identified with the god of nightly thunders in some forms of mythology. At Co-

Jupiter Infernus; and as the *Dispater* of the Tuscans was called *Mantus*, and his wife *Mania*, we may conjecture that *Sub-manus* was perhaps in Tuscan *Zuv-manus* or *Jupiter-bonus*, which is the common euphemism in speaking of the infernal deities. The connexion between the nightly thunders, which the ancients so greatly feared, and the χθονίαι βρονταί, is obvious. Another gloomy form of the supreme god was *Ve-djus* or *Ve-jovis*, who seems to have represented Apollo in his character of the causer of sudden death. The prefix *Ve-* is a disqualifying negative—the name signifies "the bad Jupiter." He was represented as a young man armed with arrows; his feast was on the nones of March, when an atoning sacrifice was offered up to him; and he was considered, like *Summanus*, as another form of Pluto.

The second of the great Tuscan deities was *Jûno* (*Jovino* or *Dyuno*), who was called *Kupra* and *Thalna* in the Etrurian language. Now *Kupra* signifies "good," as has been shown above; and therefore *Dea kupra* is *Dea bona*, the common euphemism for Proserpine. The name *Thalna* may be analysed with the aid of the principles developed above. The Etruscans had a tendency to employ the aspirates for the tenues, where in other forms, and in Greek especially, the tenues were used. Accordingly, if we articulate between the liquids *ln*, and substitute *t* for *th*, we shall have, as the name of Juno, the goddess of marriage, the form *Tal*[*a*]*na*, which at once suggests the root of *Talassus*, the Roman *Hymen*, and the Greek τάλις, (Soph. *Antig.* 629. τάλις· ἡ νύμφη, Zonar. p. 1711. τάλις· ἡ μελλόγαμος παρθένος καὶ κατὼνομασμένη τινί· οἱ δὲ γυναῖκα γαμετήν· οἱ δὲ νύμφην, Hesych. τήλιδα· οὕτω τὴν συνηρμοσμένην, id. δαλίδας· τὰς μεμνηστευμένας, id. τᾶλιξ· ἔρως, id.): comp. also γάμοιο τέλος, Hom. *Od.* XX. 74, and the epithet Ἥρα τελεία. The Aramæan ταλιθά (תְּלִיתָא, *Mark* v. 41) is not to be referred to this class.

The deity *Vulcanus*, who in the Etruscan mythology was one of the chief gods, being one of the nine thundering gods, and who in other mythologies appears in the first rank of divinities, always stands in a near relationship to Juno. In the Greek theogony he appears as her son and defender; he is sometimes

---

lonus, where the infernal deities were especially worshipped, the τιτὰν Προμηθεύς, ὁ πυρφόρος θεός, was reckoned among them (*Œd. Col.* 55).

the rival, and sometimes the duplicate, of his brother Mars; and it is possible that in the Egyptian calendar he may have been a kind of Jupiter. Here we are only concerned with the form of his Etruscan name, which was *Sethlans*. Applying the same principles as before, we collect that it is only *Se-tal[a]nus*, a masculine form of *Tal[a]na* (=*Juno*) with the prefix *Se-*: comp. the Greek ἠ-λιος, σε-λήνη, with the Latin *Sol, Luna*, where the feminine, like *Tal[a]na*, has lost the prefix.

To the two deities *Tina* and *Talna*, whose names, with their adjuncts, I have just examined, the Etruscans added a third, *Minerva*, or, as they called her, *Ménerfa*, *Ménrfa*, who was so closely connected with them in the reverence of this people, that they did not consider a city complete if it had not three gates and three temples dedicated to Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva. She was the goddess of the storms prevalent about the time of the vernal equinox; and her feast, the *quinquatrus*, was held, as that word implied in the Tuscan language, on the fifth day after the ides of March. The name seems to have been synonymous with the Greek μῆτις; and bears the same relation to *mens* that *luerves* (in the Arval hymn) does to *lues:* this appears from the use of the verb *promenervat* (*pro monet*, Fest. p. 205).

With regard to the legend that Minerva sprang from the head of Jupiter, it is to be remarked that the head was considered to be the seat of the *mens*, as the heart was of the *animus;* whereas the *anima*, (Lucret. III. 354) *permixta corpore toto*, is diffused all over the frame, and has no special seat assigned to it. With regard then to the opposition of *mens* and *animus*, the English antithesis of "head" and "heart" sufficiently expresses it. See Ter. *Andr.* I. 1, 137.

It is easy to explain the names *Sāturnus, Vertumnus, Mars*, and *Feronia*, from the elements of the Latin language. *Sāturnus*=Κρόνος is connected with *sæ-culum*, as *æ-ternus* with *ævum* (the full form being *ævi-ternus*, Varro, *L. L.* VI. § 11), *sempi-ternus* with *semper*, and *taci-turnus* with *taceo*. *Vertumnus* is the old participle of *vertor*, "I turn or change myself." (See Ch. XII. § 5). *Mârs* is simply "the male" or "manly god." Thus *Mas-piter* is "the male or generating father." The forms *Mar-mar, Ma-murius* exhibit the root with an intensive reduplication; the root is strengthened by *t*, denoting personality, in *Mar[t]s;* and the words *Ma-vor[t]s, Ma-mer[t]s* give us both

the intensive reduplication and the strengthening affix (Corssen, *Zeitschr. f. Vergl. Sprf.* 1852, p. 32). In this word the idea of virility is connected with that of protection, and the root is identical with the Greek Fαρ-, Sanscr. *vrĭ*, Latin *vir*, &c. (*New Crat.* § 285). It has been proposed by Pott (*Etym. Forsch.* II. 206) to connect *mas* with the Sanscrit root *man* "to think," from whence comes *manas* "the mind," *manusya* "man;" and we know that this root with these connected meanings runs through a great number of languages: thus we have the Egyptian *men* "to construct or establish," *month* "a man," the Greek *μέμονα*, *μηνύω*, &c., the Latin *mon-eo*, *me-mini*, *mens*, *ho-min*, the German *meinen*, *mund*, &c.; and this brings us back to the goddess *Minerva*, and other mythological beings, as *Menu*, *Menes*, *Minos*, *Minyas*, and *Mannus* (*Q. R.* CLV. p. 149). We may also remark that the Hebrew זָכָר *mas*, is immediately connected with זָכַר *meminit*. But here the idea is somewhat different. For the verb זָכַר contains the root *kar* which is found in the Chald. דְּכַר and כָּר, and signifies *infigere*, *insculpere*, hence tropically *memoriæ infigere*, *imprimere*, (Fürst, *Concord.* p. 352). And as זָכָר is opposed to נְקֵבָה from נָקַב *perforavit*—(*a membri genitalis forma distinctionis causa sic dicta*, Fürst, *Concord.* p. 727), we may conclude that it signifies: *ὁ τρυπῶν*, (cf. Æsch. *Fragm. Dan.* 38: *ἐρᾷ μὲν ἁγνὸς οὐρανὸς τρῶσαι χθόνα.*). Be this as it may, it is clear that the root Fαρ- is not identical with the root *man;* and it is quite possible that man should appear distinctively as "the protector," as well as generally in the character of "thinker" and "indicator." There is the same opposition with the same parallelism in *manus*, the hand, generally, and specially the right hand, as pointing out and indicating (cf. *μην-ύω*, *mon-strare*, *δεξ-ία*, *δείκ-νυμι*, &c.), and *ἀριστερός*, the left hand, as carrying the weapon of defence (*New Crat.* § 162, note). The attributes of the goddess *Féronia* are by no means accurately known: there seems, however, to be little doubt that she was an elementary goddess, and as such perhaps also a subterraneous deity, so that her name will be connected with *féralis*, *φθείρειν*, *φερσεφόνη*, &c.

Λευκοθέα, "the white goddess," had a Tuscan representative in the *Mater matuta*, "mother of the morning," whose attribute is referred to in the Greek name, which designates the pale

silvery light of the early dawn. Both goddesses were probably also identical with Εἰλείθυια, *Lucina*, the divinity who brought children from the darkness of the womb into the light of life. *Sothina*, a name which occurs in Etruscan monuments (Lanzi, II. p. 494), is probably the Etruscan transcription of the Greek Σοωδῖνα ("saving from child-bed pains"), which was an epithet of Artemis (see Böckh, *Corp. Inscr.* no. 1595).

Apollo was an adopted Greek name, the Tuscan form being *Apulu*, *Aplu*, *Epul*, or *Epure*. If the "custos Soractis Apollo," to whom the learned Virgil (*Æn.* XI. 786) makes a Tuscan pray, was a native Etruscan god, then his name *Soranus*, and the name of the mountain *Soracte*, must be Tuscan words, and contain the Latin *sol*, with the change from *l* to *r* observable in the form *Epure* for *Epul:* compare also the Sanscr. *Sûrya*.

Although *Neptunus* was an important god in the Tuscan pantheon, it is by no means certain that this was the Tuscan form of his name: if it was, then we have another Tuscan word easily explicable from the roots of the Indo-Germanic language; for *Nep-tunus* is clearly connected with νέω, Νηρεύς, νίπτω, &c. The form *Neptumnus* (ap. Grut. p. 460) is simply the participle νιπτόμενος. If the word *Nethuns*, which is found on a Tuscan mirror over a figure manifestly intended for Neptune (*Berlin. Jahrb.* for August 1841, p. 221), is to be considered as the genuine form of the sea-god's name, there will of course be no difficulty in referring it to the same root (see below, § 5).

The Tuscan Pluto, as is well known, was called *Mantus*, and from him the city *Mantua* derived its name. The etymology of this word is somewhat confused by its contact with the terms *manes* and *mania*. That the latter are connected with the old word *manus* = *bonus* can hardly be doubted[1]; and the deprecatory euphemism of such a designation is quite in accordance with the ancient mode of addressing these mysterious functionaries of the lower world. But then it is difficult to explain *Mantus* as a derivative from this *manus*. Now, as he is represented in all the Tuscan monuments as a huge wide-mouthed monster with a *personæ pallentis hiatus*, it seems better to understand his name as signifying "the devourer;" in which

[1] Varro seems to connect the word *Manius* with *mane*, "morning" (*L. L.* IX. § 60).

sense he may be compared with the yawning and roaring *Charon*[1]. This, at any rate, was the idea conveyed by the *manducus*, another form of *mantus*; for this was an image "*magnis malis ac late dehiscens et ingentem dentibus sonitum faciens*" (Fest. p. 128). The two words may be connected with *ma-n-dere*, μασᾶσθαι, the *n*, which is necessary in *manus*, *manes*, being here only euphonical: similarly, we have *masucium*, *edacem a mandendo scilicet* (Fest. p. 139), and *me-n-tum* by the side of ματύαι (= γνάθοι, Hesych.). Compare also *mâla*, *maxilla*, &c. It is not improbable that the Greek, or perhaps Pelasgic, μάντις contains this root. The mysterious art of divination was connected, in one at least of its branches, with the rites of the infernal gods. *Teiresias*, the blind prophet, was especially the prophet of the dark regions. Now *Mantua*, according to Virgil, was founded by *Ocnus*, "the bird of omen," who was the son of *Manto*, and through her the grandson of *Teiresias*. This at least is legendary evidence of a connexion between *mantus* and μάντις. The same root is contained in the mythical *mundus* (Müller, *Etrusk.* II. p. 96).

The name *Ceres* is connected with *creare*, Sanscr. *krĭ*. The Tuscan name *Ancaria* may be explained by a comparison of *ancilla*, *anclare*, *oncare*, ἐνεγκεῖν, ἀγκάς, &c.

According to Servius, *Ceres*, *Pales*, and *Fortuna*, were the three *Penates* of the Etruscans (see Micali, *Storia*, II. p. 117). The last of these three was one of the most important divinities in Etruria, and especially at Volsinii, where she bore the name *Nortia*, *Norsia*, or *Nursia*, and was the goddess of the calendar or year (Cincius, *ap. Liv.* VII. 3). The nails, by which the calendar was marked there, pointed to the fixed and unalterable

---

[1] See *New Crat.* § 283. Another personage of the same kind is Γηρύων, "the caller." As Charon is attended by the three-headed Κέρβερος, so the three-bodied Geryon has a two-headed dog, Ὄρθρος, who is brother to Cerberus (Hesiod. *Theog.* 308, sqq.); that is "the morning" (ὄρθρος) is brother to "the darkness" (κέρβερος: vide *Schol. Od.* Λ, 14, and Porson *ad l.*; Κέμμερος· ἀχλύς, Hesych.; and Lobeck, *Paralipom.* p. 32). By a similar identity, Geryon lives in the distant west, in Erythia, the land of darkness, just as Charon is placed in Hades; and these two beings, with their respective dogs, both figure in the mythology of Hercules, who appears as the enemy of Pluto, and of his type, Eurystheus. It may be remarked, too, that Pluto is described as an owner of flocks and herds, which is the chief feature in the representations of Geryon.

character of the decrees of fate. The *Fortuna* of Antium had the nail as her attribute, and the *clavi trabales* and other implements for fastening marked her partner *Necessitas* (Hor. I. *Carm.* XXXV. 17, sqq.); under the Greek name of Ἄτροπος (*Athrpa*) she is represented on a Tuscan patera as fixing the destiny of Μελέαγρος (*Meliacr*) by driving in a nail; though it is clear from the wings that the name only is Greek, while the figure of the deity is genuine Etruscan (Müller, *Etrusk.* II. p. 331). From these considerations it seems a safe inference that *Nortia*, or *Nursia*, is simply *ne-vortia*, *ne-vertia*, the Ἄ-τροπος, or "unturning, unchanging goddess," according to the consistent analogy of *rursus* = *re-versus*, *quorsus* = *quo-versus*, *introrsus* = *intra-versus*, &c.: and this supposition receives additional confirmation from the statement mentioned below (§ 3), that *vorsus* was actually a Tuscan word.

The god *Merquurius* appears on the Tuscan monuments as *Turms* = *Turmus*. This Etruscan name has been well explained by the Jesuit G. P. Secchi (*Annali dell' Instituto*, VIII. pp. 94, sqq.). It appears that Lycophron, who elsewhere uses genuine Italian names of deities and heroes (as Μάμερτος for Ἄρης, vv. 938, 1410; Νανός for Ὀδυσσεύς, v. 1244), calls the χθόνιος Ἑρμῆς by the name Τερμιεύς (*Alex.* 705, sqq.):

> λίμνην τ' Ἄορνον ἀμφιτορνητὸν βρόχῳ
> καὶ χεῦμα Κωκυτοῖο λαβρωθὲν σκότῳ
> Στυγὸς κελαινῆς νασμόν, ἔνθα Τερμιεὺς
> ὁρκωμότους ἔτευξεν ἀφθίτους ἕδρας
> μέλλων γίγαντας κἀπὶ τιτῆνας περᾶν.

Now *Turmus* certainly does not differ more from this Τερμιεύς than *Euturpe* and *Achle* from their Greek representatives (Bunsen, ibid. p. 175). It might seem, then, that *Turmus* is not the Latin *Terminus*, but rather the Greek Ἑρμῆς; for the Hellenic aspirate being represented in the Pelasgian language, according to rule, by the sibilant, this might pass into τ, as in ἡμέρα, σήμερον, τήμερον; ἕπτα, τέπτα, Hesych.; ἑρμίς, τερμίς, id. &c.

The name *Lar*, *Las*, when it signifies "lord" or "noble," has the addition of a pronominal affix *-t*; when it signifies "god," it is the simple root: the former is *Lars* (*Larth*), gen. *Lartis*; the latter *Lar*, gen. *Laris*. Precisely the same difference is observable in a comparison between Ἄνακες, Ἄνακοι, "the Dioscuri," and ἄνακ-τες, "kings" or "nobles." Similarly the original *Mar-s* seen in the forms *Mar-mar*, *Ma-murius*, &c. is

lengthened into *Mar-t-*, and from names of towns we have derivatives with the same insertion of a formative *t*: e. g. *Tuder-t-es*, *Tibur-t-es*, *Picen-t-es*, *Fiden-t-es*, *Fucen-t-es*, *Nar-t-es* (Corssen, *Zeitschr. f. Vergl. Sprf.* 1852, pp. 6, 13). Some suppose that the English *Lor-d* is connected with the same root; see, however, *New Crat.* § 338: and as the *Lares* were connected with the Cabiriac and Curetic worship of the more eastern Pelasgians, I would rather seek the etymology in the root λα-, λας-, λαις-, so frequently occurring in the names of places and persons connected with that worship[1], and expressing the devouring nature of fire. It appears from the word *Lar-va* that the *Lar* was represented as a wide-mouthed figure. There are two feminine forms of the name, *Lar-unda* and *Lar-entia*.

This enumeration of the names of Tuscan divinities shows that, as far as the terms of mythology are concerned (and there are few terms less mutable), the Tuscan language does not absolutely escape from the grasp of etymology. If the suggestion thrown out above (Ch. II. § 22) respecting the parallelism between *Tina* and *Tor* is to be received, the easy analysis of these mythical names is to be explained by the fact that they belonged to the religion of southern Etruria, which was Pelasgian rather than Scandinavian. Many of the common words which have been handed down to us present similar traces of affinity to the languages of the Indo-Germanic family. I will examine them in alphabetical order; though, unfortunately, they are not so numerous as to assume the form of a comprehensive vocabulary of the language.

§ 3. *Alphabetical List of Etruscan Words interpreted.*

Æsar, "God." Sueton. *Octav.* c. 97: "Responsum est centum solos dies posthac victurum, quem numerum c littera notaret; futurumque ut inter deos referretur, quod ÆSAR, id est, reliqua pars e Cæsaris nomine, Etrusca lingua *deus* vocaretur." Conf. Dio. Cass. LVI. 29; Hesych. *αἰσοί· θεοί, ὑπὸ Τυῤῥηνῶν.* See Ritter, *Vorhalle*, pp. 300, 471, who compares the Cabiriac names *Æs-mun*, *Æs-clef*, the proper name *Æsyetes*, *asa* the

[1] The following are some of the most obvious appearances of this root: Sanscrit, *las*, "to wish;" Latin, *lar-gus*; Greek, λα-μία, λά-μος, λάρυγξ, λαῖτμα, &c. Λήμνος, Λητώ.

old form of *ara,* and a great many other words implying "holiness" or "sanctity:" and Grimm, *Deutsche Mythol.* 2d edit. p. 22. Comp. also *αἶσα.* The most important fact is that *as* or *ass,* pl. *aesir,* meaning *deus, numen,* is "*nomen nusquam non occurrens*" (*Edda Sæmund.* Vol. I. p. 472) in the old Icelandic.

Agalletor, "son." Hesych. *ἀγαλλήτορα· παῖδα, Τυῤῥηνοί.* This is pure Pelasgian, if not Greek. Thus Sophocles, *Antig.* 1115, calls Bacchus: *Καδμείας νύμφας ἄγαλμα.*

Aifil, "age." This word frequently occurs in sepulchral inscriptions with a numeral attached. In one of these we have, *Cf*[*e*]*cilfiilf . Papa aif .* XXII., with the Latin translation, *Guegilii Papii ætatis* XXII. It is obvious, then, that this word contains the same root as *æv-um, æ-tas, αἰFών, αἰFεί,* &c. The Pelasgo-Tyrrhenian language always inserts the digamma in these cases: compare *Αἴας,* written *Aifas* on the Tuscan monuments.

Antar, "eagle." Hesych. *ἄνταρ· ἀετὸς ὑπὸ Τυῤῥηνῶν.* See below, under *Fentha.*

Antes, "wind." Hesych. *ἄνται· ἄνεμοι* and *ἄνδας· Βορεάς, ὑπὸ Τυῤῥηνῶν.* This is neither more nor less than the Latin *ventus,* which is ultimately identical with the Greek *Fάνεμος.*

Apluda, "bran." Fest. p. 10. Aul. Gell. XI. 7: "*Hic* inquit, *eques Romanus apludam edit, et floces bibit.* Aspexerunt omnes qui aderant alius alium, primo tristiores turbato et requirente vultu, quidnam illud utriusque verbi foret; post inde, quasi nescio quid *Tusce* aut Gallice dixisset, universi riserunt. Legerat autem ille *apludam* veteres rusticos frumenti furfurem dixisse." The passage does not prove that *apluda* was Tuscan. The word was probably derived from *abludo:* cf. Virg. *Georg.* I. 368, 9:

> Sæpe levem paleam et frondes volitare caducas,
> Aut summa nantes in aqua *conludere* plumas.

Aquilex, "a collector of springs for aqueducts." Varro *ap. Nonn. Marc.* 2, 8: "at hoc pacto, utilior te Tuscus *aquilex.*"

Aracos, "a hawk." Hesych. *Ἄρακος· ἱέραξ, Τυῤῥηνοί.* See *Haruspex.*

Arimus, "ape." Strabo, XIII. p. 626 D.: *καὶ τοὺς πιθήκους φασὶ παρὰ τοῖς Τυῤῥηνοῖς ἀρίμους καλεῖσθαι.* Hesych.:

ἄριμος· πίθηκος. There is no certainty about this word. There is some confusion of ideas between the place called *Arimi* on the coast of Cilicia, and the island *Pithecusa* on the coast of Campania. The commentators would connect it with the Hebrew חָרוּם (*châram*), *Levit.* xxi. 18, which signifies "snub-nosed," *simus;* if this can be admitted, the only way of explaining the Semitic etymology will be by reading παρὰ τοῖς Τυρίοις in the passage of Strabo.

Arse-verse. Fest. p. 18: "*Arseverse* averte ignem significat. Tuscorum enim lingua *arse* averte, *verse* ignem constat appellari. Unde Afranius ait: Inscribat aliquis in ostio arseverse." An inscription found at Cortona contains the following words: *Arses vurses Sethlanl tephral ape termnu pisest estu* (Orelli, no. 1384). Müller considers this genuine (*quem quominus genuinum habeamus nihil vetat*); Lepsius will not allow its authenticity, but thinks it is made up of words borrowed from other sources. Be this as it may, the words *arse verse* must be admitted as genuine Etruscan; and they are also cited by Placidus (*Gloss. apud Maium*, p. 434). It seems probable that *arse* is merely the Latin *arce* with the usual softening of the guttural; and *verse* contains the root of πῦρ, *pir, feuer, ber*, &c. Pott (*Et. Forsch.* I. p. 101) seems to prefer taking *verse* as the verb, Lat. *verte*, and *arse* as the noun, comp. *ardere*. *Tephral* must be compared with *tepidus* and the other analogies pointed out above (Ch. II. § 11); it comes very near to the Oscan *teforom* (*Tab. Agn.* ll. 17, 20), and to the form *thipurenai* in the Cervetri inscription (below, § 5). From all these reasons we may conclude that it belongs to the Pelasgian element in the language. If the Cortona inscription is genuine, we must divide *pis-est* = *qui est*, and then the meaning must be, "Avert the fire, O consuming Vulcan, from the boundary which is here."

Atæsum, "a vine that grows up trees." Hesych. ἄταισον· ἀναδένδρας, Τυῤῥηνοί. Can this be the Latin word *adhæsum?* Lucret. IV. 1243: "tenve locis quia non potis est adfigere *adhæsum*."

Atrium, "the *cavædium*," or common hall in a Roman house. Varro, *L. L.* V. § 161: "*Cavum ædium* dictum, qui locus tectus intra parietes relinquebatur patulus, qui esset ad communem omnium usum... *Tuscanicum* dictum a Tuscis, postea-

quam illorum cavum ædium simulare cœperunt. *Atrium* appellatum ab Atriatibus Tuscis; illinc enim exemplum sumptum." Müller (*Etrusk.* I. p. 256) adopts this etymology (which is also suggested by Festus, p. 13), with the explanation, that the name is not derived from *Atrias* because the people of that place invented it, but from a reference to the geographical position of Atrias, which, standing at the confluence of many rivers, might be supposed to represent the *compluvium* of the atrium. This geographical etymology appears to me very far-fetched and improbable; nor, indeed, do I see the possibility of deriving *atrium* from *atrias;* the converse would be the natural process. There does not appear to be any objection to the etymology suggested by Servius (*ad Æn.* III. 353): "ab *atro,* propter fumum qui esse solebat in *atriis:*" and we may compare the corresponding Greek term *μέλαθρον.* If *atrium,* then, was a Tuscan word, the Latin *ater* also was of Pelasgian origin. The connexion of *atrium* with *αἴθριον, αἴθουσα,* &c., suggested by Scaliger and others, may be adopted, if we derive the word from the Tuscan *atrus,* which signifies "a day."

Balteus, "the military girdle," is stated by Varro (*Antiq. R. Hum.* 18. *ap. Sosip.* I. p. 51) to have been a Tuscan word. It also occurs, with the same meaning, in all the languages of the German family; and we have it still in our word "belt," which bears a close resemblance to the Icelandic noun *belti* = *zona* and the corresponding verb *belta=cingere.*

Burrus "a beetle," Hesych. Βυῤῥός· *κάνθαρος,* Τυῤῥηνοί. Is this the Latin word *burrus?* Festus, p. 31: "*burrum* dicebant antiqui, quod nunc dicimus rufum. Unde rustici *burram* appellant buculam, quæ rostrum habet rufum. Pari modo rubens cibo ac potione ex prandio *burrus* appellatur."

Bygois, a nymph, who taught the Etruscans the art of interpreting lightning. Serv. *ad Æneid.* VI. Vide Dempster, *Etrur. Reg.* III. 3.

Camillus, "*Mercury.*" Macrob. *Saturn.* III. 8: "Tuscos *Camillum* appellare Mercurium." This is the Cabiriac or Pelasgian Κασμίλος. Schol. *Apoll. Rhod.* I. 915.

Capra, "a she-goat." Hesych. *κάπρα· αἴξ,* Τυῤῥηνοί.

Capys, "a falcon." Servius (*ad Æn.* X. 145): "Constat eam (capuam) a Tuscis conditam de viso falconis augurio, qui

Tusca lingua *capys* dicitur." Fest. p. 43: "Capuam in Campania quidam a *Capye* appellatam ferunt, quem a pede introrsus curvato nominatum antiqui nostri Falconem vocant." For the meaning of the word *falcones*, see Fest. s. v. p. 88. If *capys* = *falco*, it should seem that *cap-ys* contains the root of *cap-ere;* for this would be the natural derivation of the name: cf. *ac-cip-iter*. The word *cape* which appears in the great Perugian Inscription (l. 14) is probably to be referred to a very different root[1].

Cassis, "a helmet" (more anciently *cass-ila*, Fest. p. 48). Isidor. *Origg.* XVIII. 14: "*Cassidem* autem a Tuscis nominatam dicunt." The proper form was *capsis*, as the same writer tells us; but the assimilation hardly disguises the obvious connexion of the word with *cap-ut*, *haup-t*, &c. Comp. κοττικαί· αἱ περικεφαλαῖαι, with τῆς κοττίδος· Δωριεῖς δὲ τὴν κεφαλὴν οὕτω καλοῦσιν. J. Pollux, II. 29.

"*Celer*, si Tzetzi fides præbeatur, vox Latina fuit ex Etrusco nomine usque a Romuli ætate." Amaduzzi, *Alphab. Vet. Etrusc.* p. lxix.

Cyrniatæ, Tyrrhenian settlers in Corsica. Hesych. Κυρνιᾶτα[ι· οἱ] ἐπὶ Κύρνον ᾤκησαν Τυῤῥηνοί, according to Is. Voss's emendation for Κυρνιάτα ἄ.

Damnus, "a horse," Hesych.: δάμνος· ἵππος, Τυῤῥηνοί. This seems to be an Etruscan, not a Pelasgian word, and suggests at once the O. N. *tamr* = *domitus, assuetus, cicur;* N. H. G. *Zahm*.

---

[1] See *New Cratylus*, § 455. To the instances there cited the following may be added: (a) כֶּלֶב, "a dog," i. e. "the *yelp*-er." (b) עֹרֵב, "a raven" (*corv-us*, Sanscr. *kârav-*), i. e. "a cawing bird." (c) *βοῦς*, Sanscr. *gaus*, "the bellowing or lowing animal:" comp. *βοάω* with *γοάω*, and the latter with the Hebrew גָּעָה, *mugire*, "to low like an ox" (1 *Sam.* vi. 12, *Job* vi. 5), and the Latin *ceva*, which, according to Columella (VI. 24), was the name of the cow at Altinum on the Adriatic. (d) *χήν*, "the goose," i. e. "the gaping bird" (*χὴν κεχηνώς*, Athen. p. 519. A). (e) זְאֵב, "the tawny wolf," may be connected with זָהֹב, "yellow" like gold. Perhaps the most remarkable instance of selecting for the name of an object some single attribute, is furnished by the words *scudo* and "crown," both denoting a large silver coin, and both deriving their origin from a part of the design on the reverse—the former from the shield, or coat of arms, the latter from the crown, by which it was surmounted.

Dea, i. e. *bona Dea*, "Cybele." Hesych. δέα· Ῥέα, ὑπὸ Τυῤῥηνῶν.

Druna, "sovranty." Hesych. δρουνα· ἡ ἀρχή, ὑπὸ Τυῤῥηνῶν. It is clear that this word can have nothing to do with the Low-Greek δροῦγγος, "a body of men," δρουγγάριος, "a captain," which are fully explained by Du Cange, *Gloss. Med. et Inf. Græcit.* I. pp. 333, 4. We must refer it to the O. Norse, *drott = dominus, at drottna = imperare*, the dental mutes being absorbed before the *n* as in δει-νός for δειδ-νός, &c. And thus we get another trace of Gothic affinity for the Rasena.

Falandum, "the sky." Fest. p. 88: "*Falæ* [φάλαι· ὄρη, σκοπιαί, Hesych.] dictæ ab altitudine, a *falando*, quod apud Etruscos significat cœlum." This is generally connected with φάλανθον, *blond*, &c. Or we might go a step farther, and refer it to φάλλω, φαλός, &c., which are obviously derived from φάος: see Lobeck, *Pathol.* p. 87.

Favissa, "an excavation." Fest. p. 88: "*Favissæ* locum sic appellabant, in quo erat aqua inclusa circa templa. Sunt autem, qui putant, favissas esse in Capitolio cellis cisternisque similes, ubi reponi erant solita ea, quæ in templo vetustate erant facta inutilia." From the analogy of *favissa, mantissa*, and from the circumstance that the Romans seem to have learned to make *favissæ* from the Etruscans, it is inferred that *favissa* was a Tuscan word: see Müller, *ad Festi locum*, and *Etrusk.* II. p. 239. The word is probably connected with *fovea, bauen*, &c. We shall see below that *lautn* was the Rasenic synonym.

Februum, "a purification." Angrius, *ap. J. Lyd. de Mens.* p. 70: "Februum *inferum* esse Thuscorum lingua." Also Sabine: see Varro, *L. L.* VI. § 13. If we compare *febris*, &c., we shall perhaps connect the root with *foveo=torreo*, whence *favilla*, &c., and understand the "*torrida* cum mica farra," which, according to Ovid (*Fast.* II. 24), were called by this name.

Fentha, according to Lactantius (*de Fals. Relig.* I. c. 22, § 9), was the old Italian name of *Fatua*, the feminine form of *Faunus*, "quod mulieribus fata canere consuevisset, ut Faunus viris." The form *Finthia* seems to occur on an old Tuscan monument (*Ann. dell' Instit.* VIII. p. 76), and is therefore perhaps a Tuscan word. The analogy of *Fentha* to *Fatua*

is the same as that which has been pointed out above in the case of *Mantus*. The *n* is a kind of *anuswârah* very common in Latin: comp. ἔχις, *anguis*; λείπω, *linquo*; λείχω, *lingo*; Sanscr. *tudâmi*, *tundo*; ὕδωρ, *unda*; &c.

Floces, "dregs of wine," Aul. Gell. XI. 7; "*floces* audierat prisca voce significare vini fæcem e vinaceis expressam, sicuti fraces ex oleis." Above s. v. *Apluda*.

Fruntac; see *Haruspex*, and *Phruntac*.

Gapus, "a chariot." Hesych.: γάπος· ὄχημα, Τυῤῥηνοί. We have here Ϝάπος, a short Pelasgian form of ἀπήνη. Comp. *habena* with χαβός (Hesych.), σελήνη with σέλας, *avena* with αὐός, &c.

Ginis, "a crane." Hesych.: γ[ι]νίς· γέρανος, Τυῤῥηνοί. This is probably some shortened form like the Latin *grus*.

Haruspex is generally considered to have been an Etruscan word. Strabo, XVI. p. 762, renders it by ἱεροσκόπος: *asa* or *ara* certainly implied "holiness" in the Tuscan language; and Hesychius has the gloss, ἄρακος· ἱέραξ, Τυῤῥηνοί, which shows the same change from ἱερ- to *har-* (see above, p. 152). If these analogies are not overthrown by the *Inscriptio bilinguis* of Pisaurum (*Fabrett. Inscr.* c. X. n. 171, p. 646; Oliv. *Marm. Pisaur.* n. 27, p. 11; Lanzi, II. p. 652, n. δ, where [*Caf*]*atius L. f. Ste. haruspex fulguriator* is translated by *Caphates Ls. Ls. Netmfis Trutnft Phruntac*), we may perhaps conclude that *haruspex* was the genuine Pelasgian form, *trutnft* being the Rasenic or Etruscan synonym. For the word *harus* or *ars-* see the Umbrian *ars-mo* (above, p. 97). On the supposition that *trutnft* corresponds to *haruspex*, it furnishes an important confirmation of the general theory respecting the Low German origin of the Rasena. For the oldest forms of Scandinavian divination exhibit to us the haruspex furnished with a wand which he waves about, and the Northmen no less than the Greeks regarded an oracular communication as emphatically the truth: see note on Pind. *Ol.* VIII. 2, and compare *Hymis-Quida* I. *Edd. Sæmund*, I. p. 118:

'Athr sathir yrthí
Hristo *teina*
Ok á hlaut sá.

which is rendered: "antequam *verum* deprehenderent, con-

cusserunt *bacillos* (divinatorios) et sanguinem sacrum inspexerunt." With this view of divination the *lituus* of the Etruscan augur entirely corresponds: and as *tru* in Icelandic signifies *fides* or *religio*, and *fit-la* = *leviter digitos movere*, I recognise *teinn* = *bacillus* in the middle of *tru-tn-ft*, and refer the whole to the use of the *lituus* by the Etruscan *haruspex*.

Hister, "an actor." Liv. VII. 2: "Sine carmine ullo, sine imitandorum carminum actu, ludiones ex Etruria adciti, ad tibicinis modos saltantes, haud indecoros motus more Tusco dabant. Imitari deinde eos juventus, simul inconditis inter se jocularia fundentes versibus, cœpere; nec absoni a voce motus erant. Accepta itaque res sæpiusque usurpando excitata. Vernaculis artificibus, quia *hister* Tusco verbo ludio vocabatur, nomen histrionibus inditum: qui non, sicut ante, Fescennino versu similem incompositum temere ac rudem alternis jaciebant; sed impletas modis saturas, descripto jam ad tibicinem cantu, motuque congruenti peragebant." (See above, p. 132). It appears from this, and from all we read of the *hister*, that he was a mimic actor; his dance is compared by Dionysius to the *Sicinnis;* so that the word seems to be synonymous with δεικηλίκτης, and the root is the pronoun *i-* or *hi-* (*N. Crat.* § 139), which also enters into the cognate words *i-mitor*, ἴ-σος, εἴκ-ων, &c., and appears in the termination of *oleaster*, &c. (Lobeck, *Pathol.* p. 79).

Itus, "the division of the month." Varro, *L. L.* VI. § 28: "Idus ab eo quod Tusci *itus*." Cf. Macrob. *Sat.* I. 15. As *itus* was the διχομηνία of the Tuscan lunar month, its connexion with the root *id-* or *fid-* is obvious: comp. *di-vido*, *vid-uus*, &c. So Horat. IV. *Carm.* XI. 14:

> *idus* tibi sunt agendæ,
> Qui dies mensem Veneris marinæ
> *Findit* Aprilem.

Læna, "a double cloak." Fest. p. 117: "Quidam appellatam existimant Tusce, quidam Græce, quam χλανίδα dicunt." If it be a Tuscan word, it is very like the Greek: compare *luridus*, *lac*, λιαρός, &c., with χλωρός, γά-λα, χ-λιαρός, &c. Varro (*L. L.* V. § 133) derives it from *lana*.

Lanista, "a keeper of gladiators." Isidor. *Origg.* X. p. 247: "*Lanista* gladiator, *i. e.* carnifex Tusca lingua appellatus." Comp. *lānius*, &c., from the root *lac-*. Gladiatorial games are

expressly stated to have been derived by the Romans from the Etruscans: see Nicolaus Damasc. *apud Athen.* IV. 153. F. and below s. v. *Ludus.*

Lar, "a lord." Explained above, p. 150.

Lituus, "an augur's staff, curved at the end;" also "a curved trumpet:" see Cic. *Divin.* II. 18; Liv. I. 18. It constantly occurs on Etruscan monuments (see Inghirami, VI. tav. P. 5, 1). Müller justly considers this word an adjective signifying "crooked" (*Etrusk.* II. p. 212). It contains the root *li-*, found in *li-quis, ob-liquus, li-ra, li-tus* (πλάγιος), λέχριος, λιάζειν, &c.

Lucumo, whence the Roman prænomen *Lucius* (Valer. Max. *de Nomin.* 18), "a noble." The Tuscan form was *Lauchme*, which the Umbrian Propertius has preserved in his transcription *Lucmo* (*El.* IV. 1, 29): *prima galeritus posuit prætoria Lucmo.* The word contains the root *luc-*, and may therefore be compared with the Greek Γελέοντες, designating, like the Tuscan term, a noble and priestly tribe (*N. Crat.* § 459). The ἐργάδεις correspond to the *Aruntes*, who are regularly contrasted with the *Lucumones* (above, p. 103).

Ludus. The ancients derived this word from the *Lydian* origin of the Etruscans, from whom the Romans first borrowed their dancers and players. Dionys. *Antiqu.* II. 71: καλούμενοι πρὸς αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τῆς παιδιᾶς τῆς ὑπὸ Λυδῶν ἐξευρῆσθαι δοκούσης λυδίωνες, εἰκόνες, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, τῶν Σαλίων. Appian, VIII. *de Reb. Pun.* c. 66: χορὸς κιθαριστῶν τε καὶ τιτυριστῶν εἰς μιμήματα Τυῤῥηνικῆς πομπῆς ... Λυδοὺς αὐτοὺς καλοῦσιν, ὅτι (οἶμαι) Τυῤῥηνοὶ Λυδῶν ἄποικοι. Isidor. p. 1274: "Inde Romani accersitos artifices mutuati sunt, et inde *ludi* a Lydiis vocati sunt." Hesych. II. p. 506: Λυδοὶ οὗτοι τὰς θέας εὑρεῖν λέγονται, ὅθεν καὶ Ῥωμαῖοι λουδούς φασι. Comp. also Valer. Max. II. 4, 4; Tertull. *de Spect.* V. The derivation from the ethnic name *Lydius* is of course a mere fancy. It does not, however, seem improbable that, as the armed dances as well as the clownish buffooneries of the Romans were derived from Etruria, so the name, which designated these as jokers and players (*ludiones*), was Etruscan also, like the other name *hister*, which denoted the imitative actor. If so, the word *ludus* was also of Tuscan or Pelasgian origin. Now this word *ludus* is admirably adapted to express all the functions

of the Tuscan *ludio*. It is connected with the roots of *lædo* (comp. *cudo*, *cædo*), λοίδορος, λίζω, λάσθω, (=παίζω, Hesych.). Consequently, it expresses on the one hand the amusement afforded by the gesticulations of the *ludio* (σχηματίζεται ποικίλως εἰς γέλωτα, Appian, u. s.), and on the other hand indicates the innocent brandishing of weapons by the armed *ludio* as compared with the use of arms in actual warfare. This latter sense was preserved by *ludus* to the last, as it signified the school in which the gladiators *played* or fenced with wooden foils (*rudes*) preparatory to the bloody encounters of the *arena*. That the *ludiones* were Tuscans even in the classical age, is clear from Plautus, *Curculio*, I. 2, 60, sqq.: "*péssuli*, heus, péssuli, vós salutó lubens—fíte causá mea *lúdii bárbari; súbsilite*, óbsecro, et míttite istánc foras," punning on the resemblance of *pessuli* to the *præsules* of these Tuscan dancers (see Non. Marc. c. XII. *de Doctorum Indagine*, p. 783, Gottofr.).

Luna, the Tuscan port, probably got its name from the half-moon shape of the harbour. See Pers. VI. 7, 8; Strabo, V. p. 222; Martial, XIII. 30. The Tuscan spelling was perhaps *Losna* (=*Lus-na*), which is found on a patera (see Müller, *Etrusk.* I. p. 294).

Manus or *Manis*, "good." Apparently a Tuscan word; at any rate, the *manes* were Tuscan divinities. Fest. p. 146, s. v. *Manuos;* Serv. *ad Æn.* I. 139, III. 63. So *cerus manus*, in the Salian song, was *creator bonus*. Fest. p. 122, s. v. *Matrem matutam;* comp. Varro, *L. L.* VII. § 26. We may perhaps recognise the same root in *a-mœnus*, Lithuan. *aimésnis*.

Mantisa, "weighing-meat." Fest. p. 132: "*Mantisa* additamentum dicitur lingua Tusca, quod ponderi adicitur, sed deterius et quod sine ullo usu est. Lucilius: *mantisa obsonia vincit.*" Scaliger and Voss derive it from *manu-tensa*, "eo quod manu porrigitur." It is more probably connected, like *me-n-da*, with the root of μάτην; compare *frustum* with *frustra*.

Nanus, "the pygmy." Lycophr. *Alex.* 1244: Νάνος πλαναῖσι πάντ' ἐρευνήσας μυχόν. Ubi Tzetzes: ὁ Ὀδυσσεὺς παρὰ τοῖς Τυρσηνοῖς νάνος καλεῖται, δηλοῦντος τοῦ ὀνόματος τὸν πλανήτην. This interpretation seems to be only a guess based

on the πλαναῖσι of Lycophron. The considerations mentioned above (§ 1) leave it scarcely doubtful that the Tuscan word, like the Latin *nanus*, refers to the diminutive stature of the hero, which is also implied in his common name *Ulysses*. The Greek words *νάνος*, *νάννος*, *νάνισκος*, *νανάζω*, *νάνιον*, &c. have the same meaning. The word, therefore, being common to the Tuscans, Greeks, and Romans, is indubitably of Pelasgic origin.

Nepos, "a profligate." Fest. p. 165: "*Nepos* luxuriosus a Tuscis dicitur." Probably, as Müller suggests (*Etrusk.* I. p. 277), the word which bears this meaning is not from the same root as the Siculian *nepos*, "a grandson" (Gr. *νέπους*, *ἀ-νέψιος*, Germ. *neffe*). Many etymologies have been proposed; but I am not satisfied with any one of them. Might we connect the word with *ne-pŏtis*, Gr. *ἀ-κρατής*, *ἀκόλαστος*?

Phruntac = fulguriator. See the *Inscriptio bilinguis* quoted above s. v. *Haruspex*. We must consider this Tuscan word as standing either for *Furn-tacius* or for *fulntacius*: in the former case it is connected with the Latin *furnus*, *fornax*, Greek *πῦρ*, Germ. *feur*, &c., Old Norse *fur* or *fyr*; in the latter it may be compared with *ful-geo*, *ful-men*, *φλέ-γ-ειν*, *φλό-ξ*, &c. It is not impossible that both roots may be ultimately identical: compare *creber*, *celeber*; *cresco*, *glisco*; *κραῦρος*, *καλαῦροψ*; *crus*, *σ-κέλος*; *culmen*, *celsus*, *κολοφών*, *κράνιον*, *κορυφή*, &c.; but the *r* brings the word nearer to the Old Norse, which the theory would lead us to expect; and as *tak-na* in Icelandic signifies *ominari*, we could not have a nearer translation of *haruspex fulguriator* than *truten-fit furn-tak = veri-bacillum-contrectans igne-ominans = ἀληθοραβδονόμος πυρόμαντις*.

Quinquatrus. Varro, *L. L.* VI. § 14: "*Quinquatrus*; hic dies unus ab nominis errore observatur, proinde ut sint quinque. Dictus, ut ab Tusculanis post diem sextum idus similiter vocatur *Sexatrus*, et post diem septimum *Septimatrus*, sic hic, quod erat post diem quintum idus, *Quinquatrus*." Festus, p. 254: "*Quinquatrus* appellari quidam putant a numero dierum qui feriis iis celebrantur: qui scilicet errant tam hercule, quam qui triduo Saturnalia et totidem diebus Competalia: nam omnibus his singulis diebus fiunt sacra. Forma autem vocabuli ejus, exemplo multorum populorum Italicorum enuntiata est,

quod post diem quintum iduum est is dies festus, ut aput Tusculanos *Triatrus* et *Sexatrus* et *Septimatrus* et Faliscos *Decimatrus*." See also Gell. *N. A.* II. 21. From this we infer that in the Tuscan language the numeral *quinque*, or, as they probably wrote it, *chfinchfe*, signified "five," and that *atrus* meant "a day." With this latter word, perhaps connected with *αἴθριον*, we may compare the Tuscan *atrium*, according to the second of the etymologies proposed above.

Ramnenses, Tities, Luceres. Varro, *L. L.* V. § 55: "Omnia hæc vocabula Tusca, ut Volnius, qui tragœdias Tuscas scripsit, dicebat." See Müller, *Etrusk.* I. p. 380.

Ril, "a year." This word frequently occurs before numerals in sepulchral inscriptions; and, as the word *aifil* = *ætatis* generally precedes, *ril* is supposed with reason to mean *annum* or *annos*. It is true that this word does not resemble any synonym in the Indo-Germanic languages; but then, as has been justly observed by Lepsius, there is no connexion between *annus*, *ἔτος*, and *iâr*, and yet the connexion between Greek, Latin, and German is universally admitted[1]. The word *ril* appears to me to contain the root *ra* or *re*, implying "flux" and "motion," which occurs in every language of the family, and which in the Pelasgian dialects sometimes furnished a name for great rivers (above, p. 48). Thus *Tibe-ris*, the Tuscan river, is probably "the mountain-stream;" see below, § 6. The termination *-l* also marks the Tuscan patronymics, and, in the lengthened form *-lius*, serves the same office in Latin (e. g. *Servi-lius* from *Servius*). The Greek patronymic in *-δης* expresses derivation or extraction, and is akin to the genitive-ending. This termination appears in *ῥεῖ-τον*, *ῥεῖ-θ-ρον*, &c., which may therefore be compared with *ri-l*. If the *l* represents a more original *n*, *ril* comes into immediate contact with the Icelandic *renna* "to run" or "flow," whence *retnandi vatn* = *aqua-fluens*, and the river *Rhine* probably received its name from this source, for *renna*, A. S. *rin*=*cursus aquæ*. How well suited this connexion is for the expression of time need not be pointed out to the intelligent reader. The following examples from the Latin language will show that the

[1] See the other instances of the same kind quoted by Dr. Prichard, *Journal of R. G. S.* IX. 2, p. 209.

etymology is at least not inconsistent with the forms of speech adopted by the ancient Italians. The Latin name for the year—*annus*, more anciently *anus*—of which *annulus* or *anulus* (Schneider, *Lat. Gr.* I. p. 422) is a diminutive—denotes a circle or cycle—a period—a curve returning to itself; and the same is the origin of the other meaning of *anus*, i. e. *ab orbiculari figurâ*. Now as the year was regarded as a number of months, and as the moon-goddess was generally the feminine form of the sun-god[1], we recognise *Annus* as the god of the sun, and *Anna* as the goddess of the moon; and as she recurred throughout the period of the sun's course, she was further designated by the epithet *perenna*. To this *Anna perenna*, "the ever-circling moon," the ancients dedicated the ides of March, the first full moon of the primitive year, and, as Macrobius tells us (*Saturn.* I. 12), "eodem quoque mense et publice et privatim ad *Annam Perennam* sacrificatum itur ut *annare perennareque* commode liceat." The idea, therefore, attached to her name was that of a regular flowing, of a constant recurrence; and *â-nus* denotes at once "the ever-flowing" (*ἀέ-ναος*) and "the ever-recurring" (*ἀεὶ νεόμενος*): see *N. Crat.* § 270. Now this is precisely the meaning of the common Latin adjective *perennis;* and *sollennis* (= *quod omnibus annis præstari debet*, Festus, p. 298) has acquired the similar signification of "regular," "customary," and "indispensable." It is, perhaps, worth mentioning that in a Tuscan monument (Micali, *Storia*, pl. 36) Atlas supporting the world is called *A-ril*. If Atlas was the god of the Tuscan year, this may

[1] In the *Penny Cyclopedia*, s. v. *Demeter*, I remarked, as I had previously done in the *Theatre of the Greeks*, "that in the Roman mythology as well as in the Greek, we continually find duplicate divinities male and female, and sometimes deities of a doubtful sex (Niebuhr's *Rome*, Vol. II. pp. 100, 101, Eng. Tr.; and *Philolog. Mus.* I. pp. 116, 117). Thus the sun-god and the moon-goddess are always paired together." From this the writer of the article *Roman Calendar* in Smith's *Dictionary of Antiquities*, borrowed his statement, that "the tendency among the Romans to have the same word repeated first as a male and then as a female deity, has been noticed by Niebuhr," &c.; and because I took the liberty of repeating myself, in the former edition of the present work, this compiler has assumed, with amusing effrontery, that I was copying the trifling appropriation of which he had probably forgotten the source.

serve to confirm the common interpretation of *ril;* and *â-nus= jâ-nus* will thus correspond to *â-ril* both in origin and signification; for it is certain that *νέω* and *ῥεώ* spring from a common source (*N. Crat.* u. s.).

Stroppus, "a fillet." Fest. p. 313: "*Stroppus* est, ut Ateius philologus existimat, quod Græce *στρόφιον* vocatur, et quod sacerdotes pro insigni habent in capite. Quidam coronam esse dicunt, aut quod pro corona insigne in caput imponatur, quale sit strophium. Itaque *apud Faliscos* diem festum esse, qui vocetur *struppearia,* quia coronati ambulent. Et *a Tusculanis*" [for another instance of the similarity of language between the people of Falerii and Tusculum, see under *Quinquatrus*], "quod in pulvinari imponatur, Castoris *struppum* vocari." Idem, p. 347: "*Struppi* vocantur in pulvinaribus fasciculi de verbenis facti, qui pro deorum capitibus ponuntur."

Subulo, "a flute-player." Varro, *L. L.* VII. § 35: "*Subulo* dictus quod ita dicunt tibicines Tusci: quocirca radices ejus in Etruria non Latio quærundæ." Fest. p. 309: "*Subulo* Tusce tibicen dicitur; itaque Ennius: *subulo quondam marinas adstabat plagas.*" Compare *sibilo, σίφων, si-lenus, σιφλόω, ἀ-σύφηλος,* &c. Fr. *siffler, persifler,* &c.

Toga. If *toga* was the name by which the Tuscans called their outer garment, the verb *tego* must have existed in the Tuscan language; for this is obviously the derivation. That the Tuscans wore *togas,* and that the Romans borrowed this dress from them, is more than probable (Müller, *Etrusker,* p. 262). If not, they must, from the expression used by Photius (*Lex.* s. v.), have called it *τήβεννα,* which was its name in Argos and Arcadia.

Trutnft=tru-ten-fit: see s. v. *Haruspex.*

Vorsus, "one hundred feet square," is quoted as both Tuscan and Umbrian. *Fragm. de Limit.* ed. Gœs. p. 216: "Primum agri modulum fecerunt quattuor limitibus clausum figuræ, quadratæ similem, plerumque centum pedum in utraque parte, quod Græci *πλέθρον* appellant, Tusci et Umbri *vorsum.*" For the use of *πλέθρον,* see Eurip. *Ion.* 1137. The fact that *vorsus* is a Tuscan word confirms the etymologies of *Vertumnus* and *Nortia.*

§ 4. *Etruscan Inscriptions—Difficulties attending their Interpretation.*

In passing to our third source of information respecting the Tuscan language—the inscriptions which have been preserved—we are at once thrown upon difficulties, which at present, perhaps, are not within the reach of a complete solution. We may, indeed, derive from them some fixed results with regard to the structure of the language, and here and there we may find it possible to offer an explanation of a few words of more frequent occurrence. In general, however, we want a more complete collection of these documents; one, too, in deciphering which the resources of palæography have been carefully and critically applied. When we shall have obtained this, we shall at least know how far we can hope to penetrate into the hitherto unexplored arcana of the mysterious Etruscan language.

Referring to the theory, that the Etruscan nation consisted of two main ingredients—namely, Tyrrheno-Pelasgians, more or less intermixed with Umbrians, and Rætians or Low Germans[1],—the former prevailing in the South, the latter in the

---

[1] The idea that one ingredient, at least, in the old Etruscan language was allied to the most ancient type of the Low German, as preserved in the Icelandic inscriptions, occurred to me when I was reading the Runic fragments with a different object in 1846. A long series of independent combinations was required before I could bring myself to attach any importance to the *primâ facie* resemblances which struck me on the most superficial comparison of documents, apparently so far removed from the possibility of any mutual relations. But I have quite lately discovered that the same first impressions were produced and recorded just one hundred years before I communicated my views to the *British Association*. A folio tract has come into my hands with the following title: *Alphabetum veterum Etruscorum secundis curis inlustratum et auctum a Joh. Chrst Amadutio* [Amaduzzi], Rom. 1775, and I find the following statement in p. XLI.: "nemo melius hujusmodi cerebrosa tentamina ridenda suscepit quam anonymus quidam scriptor (qui Hieronymus Zanettius Venetus a quibusdam habitus est) qui anno 1751 opusculum (*Nuova trasfigurazione delle lettere Etrusche*) edidit lepidum et festivum satis, in quo .... literas quibus [monumenta Etrusca] instructa sunt Geticas ac Runicas potius ... statuendas comminiscitur .... Id etiam nonnullis Runicis sive Geticis adductis monumentis et cum iis, quæ Etrusca censentur, facta comparatione evincere nititur." With more etymological knowledge, but with the same inability to appreciate the importance of the evidence which he

north-western part of Etruria,—it is obvious that we cannot expect to find one uniform language in the inscriptions, which belong to different epochs and are scattered over the territory occupied in different proportions by branches of cognate tribes. Accordingly, we must, if possible, discriminate between those fragments which represent the language in its oldest or un-Rasenic form, and those which exhibit scarcely any traces of a Pelasgic character.

§ 5. *Inscriptions in which the Pelasgian element predominates.*

Of all the Etruscan cities the least Rasenic perhaps is *Cære*[1] or *Agylla*, which stands in so many important connexions with Rome. Its foundation by the Pelasgians is attested by a great number of authorities (Serv. *ad Æn.* VIII. 478; Strabo, V. p. 220; Dionys. Hal. III. 58; Plin. *H. N.* III. 8): its port, Πύργοι, had a purely Pelasgian or even Greek name, and the Pelasgians had founded there a temple in honour of Εἰλήθυια (Strabo, V. 226; Diod. XV. 14). In the year 534, B.C., the people of Agylla consulted the oracle at Delphi respecting the removal of a curse; and they observed, in the days of Herodotus, the gymnic and equestrian games which the Pythoness prescribed (Herod. I. 167): moreover, they kept up a connexion with Delphi, in the same manner as the cities of Greece, and had a deposit in the bank of the temple (Strabo, V. p. 220).

As the Agyllæans, then, maintained so long a distinct Pe-

---

was adducing, the reviewer of Jäkel's superficial book in the *Quarterly Review* (Vol. XLVI. p. 347) remarks: "It is strange but true that some of the most striking coincidences are between the Latin and the Teutonic dialects of Scandinavia and Friezeland—regions which Roman foot never touched. Here are a few of the Scandinavian ones: *abstergo, affstryka; abstraho, affdraga; carus, kaer; candela, kindel; clivus, kleif* (cliff); &c. In all these cases the word has disappeared, or at least become unusual, in the German. In Friezeland *hospes* is *osb*, *macula* is *magl*, *rete* is *rhwyd*, *turtus* is *turtur*, &c."

[1] Lepsius (*die Tyrrh. Pelasger*, p. 28) considers *Cære* an Umbrian and not a Pelasgian word, *-re* being a common ending of the names of Umbrian towns; thus we have *Tute-re* on coins for *Tuder*. The original name was perhaps *Kaiere*, which contains a root expressive of antiquity and nobility (above, p. 5).

lasgian character, we might expect to find some characteristics in the inscriptions of Cære, or Cervetri, by which they might be distinguished from the monuments of northern and eastern Etruria. There is at least one very striking justification of this supposition. On an ancient vase, dug up by General Galassi at Cervetri, the following inscription is traced in very clear and legible characters:

Mi ni keθuma, mi maθu maram lišiai θipurenai;
Eθe erai sie epana, mi neθu nastav heleφu.

It is obvious that there is an heroic rhythm in these lines; the punctuation and division into words are of course conjectural. This inscription differs from those which are found in the Umbro-Etruscan or Rasenic districts, and especially from the Perusian *cippus*, in the much larger proportion of vowels, which are here expressed even before and after liquids, and in the absence of the mutilated terminations in *c*, *l*, *r*, which are so common in the other monuments. The meaning of this couplet seems to be as follows: "I am not dust; I am ruddy wine on burnt ashes: when" (or "if") "there is burning-heat under ground I am water for thirsty lips." *Mi* is clearly the mutilated *ἐ-μί=ἐσ-μί*. That the substantive verb may be reduced to *ἐ-μί*, with the first syllable short, is clear from the inscription on the Burgon vase, which Böckh has so strangely misunderstood, (*C. I.* n. 33), and which obviously consists of three cretics: *τῶν Ἀθή|-νηθεν ἄ-|θλων ἐμί.* ||. *Ni* is the original negative, which in Latin always appears in a reduplicated or compounded form. The same form appears in Icelandic. *Keθuma* is the primitive form of *χθών*, *χθαμα-λός*, *χαμαί*, *humus*, &c.; and may not *χ-θαμα-* be an offshoot of the Hebrew אַדְמָה, in which the *aleph*, as in many other cases, represents a stronger guttural? (see above, p. 76). The difference of quantity in the second *mi* will not prevent us from identifying it with the first, which is lengthened by the ictus. *Maθu* is the Greek *μέθυ*, Sanscr. *madhu*. *Maram* is the epithet agreeing with *mathu:* it contains the root *mar-*, found in *Μάρων* (the grandson of Bacchus), and in *Ἴσ-μαρος*, the site of his vineyards (see *Od.* IX. 196, sqq.), and probably signifying "ruddy" (*μαίρω*, *μαῖρα*, &c.). The fact that *Maro* was an agricultural cognomen at Mantua is an argument in favour of the Etruscan use of the root. *Lišiai* is the locative of *lišis*, an old word corresponding to *lix*, "ashes mingled with water."

Θipurenai is an adjective in concord with *lišiai*, and probably containing the same root as *tepidus, tephral, teforom*, &c. (above, pp. 48, 132). *Eθe* is some particle of condition or time. *Erai* is the locative of ἔρα, "earth." The idea of this second line is conveyed by the sneer of Lucretius, (III. 916, sq. Lachmann):

> "Tanquam in morte mali cum primis hoc sit eorum,
> Quod sitis exurat miseros atque arida *torres*."

where Lachmann quotes Cyrill. *ἀπόκαυμα ustilacio, torres;* and it is probable that *epana* is synonymous with *torres*, and that it may be connected with *δάπτω*, &c., as *epulæ* is with *δαπάνη, daps, δεῖπνον*, &c., or *ignis* with the root *dah*, "to burn." *Sie* (pronounced *syé*) is *siet = sit* (so *ar-sie = ad-sis* and *si = sit* in the Eug. Tables). There can be little doubt that *neθu* means "water" in the Tuscan language. There is an Etruscan mirror in which the figure of Neptune has superscribed the word *Nethuns = Nethu-n-*[*u*]*s*. The root is *ne-*, and appears under a slightly different development in the next word, *nastav* (comp. *νασμός, ναθμός*, O. H. G. *naz*), which is probably a locative in *-φι*, agreeing with *heleφu*, and this may be referred to *χεῖλος*, Æolice *χέλλος*, Latin *heluo*, &c.

There is another inscription in the Museum at Naples which also begins with *mi ni*, and presents in a shorter compass the same features with that which has just been quoted. It runs thus in one Hexameter line:

Mi ni mulve neke velθu ir pupliana,

and seems to mean: "I am not of Mulva nor Volsinii, but Populonia." For *neka = neque* see *N. Crat.* § 147. *Ir* is the conjunction *ἀλλά* = "but" (compare the O. N. *an-nar* with our *other, or*); and as *Velsa* or *Velthu* signifies the city *Volsinii* (Müller, *Etr.* I. p. 334), and as *pupliana* obviously refers to *Puplana = Populonia* (Müller, I. p. 331), I would suppose a place *Mulva*, whence the *pons Mulv-ius*, two miles from Rome, (Tacitus, *Annal.* XIII. 47. *Hist.* I. 87. II. 89. III. 82), and the proper name *Mulvius* (Horace, I. *Serm.* VII. 36)[1].

---

[1] Dr. Karl Meyer (in the *Gelehrter Anzeigen* of the Royal Academy at Munich, for 1843, pp. 698—735) has endeavoured to explain the two Pelasgian inscriptions on the supposition that the Pelasgians, though Caucasian, belonged to the Ægypto-(Chaldeo)-Celtic group of people, who inhabited the Caucasian regions in the most primitive times, and

Besides these, we have a great number of inscriptions beginning with the syllable *mi*, mostly from *Orvieto* (i. e. *urbs vetus, Volsinii?*); and an inspection of those among them which are most easily interpreted leaves us little reason to doubt that this syllable represents the verb εἰμί, which has suffered decapitation in the same manner as the modern Greek νά for ἵνα. A collection of these inscriptions has been made by Lanzi (*Saggio*, II. p. 319, *Epitafi scelti fra' piu antichi*, no. 188-200)[1]; and Müller thinks (*Etrusk.* I. p. 451) that they are all pure Pelasgian. Some of them, indeed, seem to be almost Greek—at least, they are more nearly akin to Greek than to Latin. Take, for instance, no. 191, which has been adduced both by Müller and by Lepsius, and which runs thus:

Mi kalairu fuius.

Surely this is little else than archaic Greek: εἰμὶ Καλαιροῦ Fυιός. In regard to the last word at any rate, even modern Latin approaches more nearly to the Etruscan type. It is well known that the termination *-al, -ul* in Etruscan indicates a patronymic. Thus a figure of Apollo, found in Picenum, is in-

---

were therefore pre-Sanscritic in the formation of their languages (p. 728). He thus borrows his suggestions from the fragmentary and half-understood remains of ancient Egyptian on the one hand, and from modern Irish and Welsh on the other—a mode of proceeding which to myself appears not likely to lead to any safe results. His interpretation of the Cervetri Inscription is as follows: "ich (*mini*, as in 2 p. pl. pass.!!) sage (Eg. *ct-* Champ. p. 378; Gaelic, *cet-aim;* Goth. *quithan*, &c.), dass ich rühme (Irish, *muidhim*) die Huld (*mâri* O. H. D. *fama*) des Lisias Purenas (Thipurenas) und die seiner Frau Gemahlin (*herae*, and Irish, *bean* = woman!) singe (Irish, *nasaim*), preise (same with *t* inserted, as in *gusto*, from γεύω!) und verkündige ich (Cymr. *hlavara*)." The following is Meyer's explanation of the Naples inscription: "Ich salbe mich mit populonischem Oele. d. i. Oel der stadt Populonia," i. e. *mulvene* is from the Irish *morfas*, "train oil," comp. μολύνειν, (!); *cevelthu*, Irish, *bealadh*, "to anoint," from ἔλαιον with the digamma, cf. βάλανος, &c., *ir* from the Egypto-Celtic *r*, *ir*, to make, as an affix to the passive voice in Latin, &c.(!) But even supposing these comparisons were as safe, as they seem to me far-fetched and improbable, why is such an inscription, applicable only to a man, found on a vessel?

[1] There is also an old inscription in the Vatican Library which belongs to the same class: *mi Venerus finucenas*, which Mommsen would render (*Unterital. Dialekte*, p. 18): *sum Veneris Erycinæ*. He has mentioned some others of the same kind.

scribed, *Jupetrul Epure*, i. e. "Jupiter's son, Apollo." The syllable *-al* corresponds to the Latin form *-alis*, but in its significance as a patronymic it is represented rather by *-i-lius*, as in *Servius, Servilius; Lucius, Lucilius;* &c. According to this analogy, *fi-lius*, from *fio*, is nearer to the Etruscan than φυιός, from the Æolic φυίω (*Et. M.* p. 254, 16).

§ 6. *Transition to the Inscriptions which contain Scandinavian words. The laurel-crowned Apollo. Explanation of the words* Clan *and* Phleres.

There is another inscription of this class which deserves particular notice, because, though it is singularly like Greek, it contains two words which are of constant occurrence in the least Pelasgian of the Etruscan monuments, and furnish us with the strongest evidence of the Low-German or Scandinavian affinities of a portion at least of the Etruscan language. A bronze figure, representing Apollo crowned with laurel (Gori, *Mus. Etrusc.* I. pl. 32), has the following inscription:

Mi phleres epul aphe aritimi
phasti ruphrua turce clen ceca.

The first sentence must mean: *sum donarium Apollini et Artemidi.* The form *Ari-timi-*, as from *Ar-timi-s*, instead of the Greek Ἀρ-τεμι[δ]ς, is instructive. We might suppose from this that *Ari-timi-s*, the "virgin of the sea," and Ἀρέ-θουσα, "the virgin swiftly flowing," were different types of one and the same goddess (see above, pp. 37, 54). Ἀρτεμής appears to me to be a derivative from Ἄρτεμις. The next words probably contain the name and description of the person who made the offering. The name seems to have been *Fastia Rufrunia* or *Rufria.* Lanzi and Müller recognise a verb in *turce*, which is of frequent occurrence on the Etruscan monuments, and translate it by ἐποίει, *dedit*, ἀνέθηκε, or the like. Lanzi goes so far as to suggest the etymology [δε-]δώρηκε. And perhaps we might make a verb of it, were it not for the context. Its position, however, between the proper name and the word *clen*, which in all other inscriptions is immediately appended to the name and description of a person, would induce me to seek the verb in *ceca* (probably a reduplication, like *pepe* on the Todi statue: compare *chu-che, cechaze* in the Perugian inscription, and *cechase* on the *Bomarzo* sarcophagus, Dennis, I. p. 313), and to suppose

that *Turce* is the genitive of the proper name *Tuscus*. The word *clen*, one of the two to which I have referred, is explained by its contrast to *eter*, *etera*,—a word clearly expressing the Greek ἕτερος, Latin *alter* (*iterum*), and Umbrian *etre*. Thus we have on the same monument;

La . Fenete La . Lethial etera
Se . Fenete La . Lethial clan:

in which, if *etera* means, as is most probable, the *second* in the family, *clan* must mean the *first* or *head* of the family. I would not on this account infer that *clan* was the ordinal corresponding in every case to *primus;* but there will be little difficulty in showing etymologically its appropriateness as the designation of the *first* of a family. The root, which in the Greek and Latin languages signifies *head, summit, top,* is *cel-, cul-, cli-,* κολ-, κορ-, or κρα-. These are in effect the same root,—compare *glisco, cresco,* &c.; and it is well known, that words denoting height and elevation—or *head-ship*, in fact—are employed to signify *rank*. Now the transition from this to primogeniture—the being first in a family—is easy and natural: compare the "patrio *princeps* donârat nomine regem" of Lucretius (I. 88). Therefore, if *clen* or *clens* (in Latin *clanis* or *clanius*) is connected with the root of *celsus, cul-men, collis, clivus,* κολοφών, κορυφή, κύριος, κοίρανος, κοῦρος, κόρος, κύρβας, κράνιον, &c., it may well be used to signify the first in a family. Cf. the Hebrew רֹאשׁ, "de cujuscunque rei initio, principio, origine (velut *fluminis*), summitate, velut de montium *verticibus*, &c." (Fürst, *Conc.* s. v.). This etymological analysis will perhaps be complete, if I add that there were two rivers in Italy which bore the name of *Clanis* or *Clanius;* the one running into the Tiber between *Tuder* and *Volsinii*, the other joining the sea near the Tuscan colony of *Vulturnum*. Now the names of rivers in the Pelasgian language seem to have some connexion with roots signifying "height," "hill," or "hill-tower." This has been indicated above in what has been said of the names of the Scythian rivers (Chap. II. § 10). The *Tibe-ris*—the "Tuscan river," as the Latin poets call it—seems to have derived its name from the Pelasgian *Teba*, "a hill," and the root *ri*, "to flow" (see above, Chap. IV. § 2). And the *Clan-is* and *Clan-ius*, which flow down from the Apennines, may well have gained a name of

similar import. If we now pass on to the northern languages, we shall find some curious extensions of these results. For while the root *kl-* in *klif, kliffe, kleyf,* signifies altitude and climbing, and while *klackr* in Icelandic denotes "a rock," we find that, with the affix *n, klen* or *klien* in Icelandic, and in Germ. *klein,* signify "little," but primarily in the sense of "a child" as opposed to "a man;" and it may be a question whether the idea of derivation, which I have just indicated in the river as compared with the mountain, may be at the basis of the ordinary meaning of *klen* or *kleine.* And thus whether the Etruscan *clen* signifies "the eldest child," or simply "the child," with an implication of primogeniture, as indicating the first contrast with the parents, the Icelandic will help the explanation. The only bilingual inscription, in which I have found *clans,* seems to imply that, unless otherwise expressed, this word merely denotes sonship. It is (Dennis, II. p. 426):

V. Caszi C. clans
C. Cassius C. F. Saturninus.

Where *C. Clans* = *C. F.,* the cognomen *Saturninus* being an addition in the Latin version. This view is confirmed by the fact that *clan* sometimes occurs in the same inscription with the matronymic in *-al,* as in the inscription quoted above; and while in the bilingual inscriptions this matronymic is rendered by *natus, clans,* as we have seen, is translated *filius,* and sometimes *filius* is added without any corresponding *clan* in the Etruscan inscriptions. The following examples will show all the different usages of this adjunct:

A. *Clan* or *clen* used with a genitive case and without any patronymic.

a. *Phasti Ruphrua Turce clen ceca.* (Gori, *Mus. Etrusc.* I. pl. 32).

b. *V. Caszi C. Clans.* (Dennis, II. p. 426).
C. Cassius C. F. Saturninus.

B. *Clan,* with a patronymic, and without a genitive:
Laris Pumpus Arnthal clan cechase. (Dennis, I. p. 313).
And so in the second inscription quoted above.

C. Patronymic without *clan*, but with *filius* in the Latin translation.

(a). *Vl. Alphni nuvi. cainal*
C. Alfius A. F. Cainnia natus. (Dennis, II. p. 354).

(b). *Vel. Venzileal Phnalisle*
C. Vensius C. F. Cæsia natus. (Id. II. p. 371).

(c). *Cuint. Sent. Arntnal*
Q. Sentius L. F. Arria natus. (Id. II. p. 412).

(d). *Pup. Velimna Au. Caphatial*
P. Volumnius A. F. Violens Cafatia natus. (Id. II. p. 475).

From this it appears that *clan* represents the son or daughter as opposed to the *father*, the mother's name being given in the *matronymic*.

The other of the two words in this inscription, to which I have adverted, is *phleres*, which clearly means *donarium*, or something of the kind. This word, as we shall see directly, occurs on a number of small Etruscan objects, which are of the nature of supplicatory gifts. And it would be only fair to conclude that the word denotes "vow" or "prayer," as included in the donation. Now we know from Festus (p. 230, cf. 77, 109) that *ploro* and *imploro* or *endoploro* in old Latin signified *inclamo* without any notion of lamentation or weeping. If, then, we compare the Icelandic *fleiri*, Suio-Gothic *flere* with the Latin *plures=ple-ores*, we shall easily see how *phleres* may contain the same root as *ploro=ple-oro* (below, Ch. XII. § 2), especially since the Latin language recognises a similar change in *fleo* compared with *pluo*. The word is then in effect equivalent to the Greek *ἀνάθημα*, as in Cicero (*ad Attic.* I. 1): "Hermathena tua valde me delectat, et posita ita belle est ut totum gymnasium *ἡλίου ἀνάθημα* esse videatur." Thus it means a votive offering, like the *votiva tabella* of the ancient temples, or the *voto* of the modern churches in Italy; and it is easy to see how the ideas of "vow," "prayer," "invocation," "offering," may be represented by such an object. Accordingly the inscription of the laurel-crowned Apollo will signify: *Sum votivum donarium Apollini atque Artemidi; Fastia Rufria, Tusci filia, faciundum curavit.* For if we compare *ceca* with *cechaze*

or *cechase*, we may render it with reference to the Icelandic *kasa*, Danish *kokase*, "to heap up" or "build."

§ 7. *Inscriptions containing the words* Suthi *and* Trce.

It has been mentioned that the word *phleres* appears on a number of smaller or moveable objects. In some of these it has appended to it the word *trce* or *thrce*. Thus we have

cen phleres trce sansl tenine. (Vermiglioli, p. 31).

cen phleres trce. (Micali, *Antichi Monumenti*, pl. 44. n. 2).

eca ersce nac achrum phler-thrce. (Dennis, I. p. xc.)

The second of these inscriptions is found on the toga of the statue of Aulus Metellus; the third appears on an amphora found at Vulci, and in connexion with a picture representing the farewell embrace of Admetus and Alcestis. It may be assumed then that the amphora was a farewell offering from a husband to his deceased wife, and that the monument of Metellus was sepulchral or funereal. If then *phleres* signifies a votive offering, the additional word *trce* or *thrce* must indicate "mourning" or "sorrow." And here the northern languages at once come to our aid; for in Suio-Gothic *trœga = dolere* and *trœge = dolor*; and in Icelandic *at trega = angere* or *dolere*, and *tregi = dolor*; and to the same root we may refer the Icelandic *threk = gravis labor* or *molestia*; for *tregi* also means *impedimentum*. See *Specimen Glossarii ad Edd. Sœmund.* Vol. II. p. 818: "(*at*) *Trega* (A) 'angere,' 'dolorem causare,' B. I. 29: *tregr mik that*, 'id mihi ægre est,' G. III. 3: *tregrath ydr* 'molestum non est vobis,' GH. 2. (B) 'dolere' 'lugere.' Hinc *treginn* 'deploratus' l. 'deplorandus' unde fœm. pl. *tregnar*. Priori sensu A. S. *tregian*. *Tregi* 'mœror, dolor' (passim), Germ. *trauer*. *Trœge, trege* 'vexatio,' 'indignatio.' Originitus forsan verbotenus: 'onus,' 'moles.' Germ. *tracht*, Dan. *draght*, Angl. *draught*. Cf. *tregr* 'invitus,' 'segnis,' Germ. *träg*, Al. *treger*. Forsan a *draga* 'trahere,' 'portare.' *Treg-rof* 'luctuum,' l. 'calamitatum series vel etiam discussio.'" The connexion of this word with *traho* brings it into still greater affinity with the old languages of Italy, and the evidence from the context is conclusive for the meaning. Many Etruscan inscriptions begin like the three quoted above

with *eca, cen*, or *cehen*, which are obviously pronouns or adverbs signifying 'here' or 'this,' in accordance with the root *k-* which appears in all the Indo-Germanic languages. The Cervetri inscription has taught us (above p. 168) that *era* signifies 'earth' (N. H. G. *erde*, Goth. *airtha*, Altfr. *irthe*, Gr. ἔρα). Consequently, *ersce* would naturally denote an earthenware vessel, for *-ska* is a very common termination in Icelandic names, as *bernska* "childishness," *ill-ska* "malice," &c. And as *cen* or *cehen* is probably an adverb, *eca* must be the feminine of the pronominal adjective *ecus, eca, ecum*, agreeing with *ersce*. As *achrum* is clearly the locative of *acher* which occurs in the great Perugian inscription, and which at once suggests the Icelandic *akr*, Germ. *acker, ager*, we may fairly conclude that *nac* is the preposition which, under the form *na, nahe, nach* is found in all the Teutonic and Sclavonian languages: and thus the Vulci inscription will mean: "this earthen vessel in the ground is a votive offering of sorrow."

By the side of *cen phleres* we have, on larger monuments, *eca* or *cehen suthi* or *suthinesl*. Thus we find:

eca suthi Larthial Cilnia (Dennis, I. p. 500.)
cehen suthi hinthiu thues (Vermiglioli, I. p. 64.)
eca suthinesl Titnie (Dennis, I. 242, 443.)
eca suthi Amcie Titial (Vermiglioli, I. p. 73.)

Here again the Icelandic comes to our aid, for *sut* is *dolor, mœstitia, luctus*, so completely a synonym of *tregi* that we have *tregnar* and *sutir* in the same stanza of *Hamdis-Mal* (*Edd. Sœmund.* II. p. 488); and *nesla* or *hnesla=funis, laqueus:* so that we may translate *eca-suthi*, "this is the mourning," and *eca suthinesl* "this is the sorrowful inscription." Comparisons of individual words in languages not known to be the same are of course eminently precarious. But it is impossible to resist the evidence of affinity furnished by the fact that the words *trce* and *suthi*, constantly occurring on Etruscan monuments of a funereal character, are translated at once by the Icelandic synonyms *tregi* and *sut*, both signifying "grief" or "sorrow." If we had only this fact we should be induced by it to seek for further resemblances between the old languages of Northern Europe and the obscure fragments of the old Etruscan.

§ 8. *Inferences derivable from the words* Sver, Cver, *and* Thur *or* Thaur.

In comparing an unknown with a known language, we derive much help from the collocation of the same or similar words, especially in short sentences. Thus when we find such collocations as the following:

phleres zek-sansl cver (Vermiglioli, p. 36),
phleres tlen-asies sver (id. p. 39),

we can hardly avoid supposing that *cver* and *sver* are slightly different forms of the same word. Now in Icelandic we find the verb *thverra* = *minui, disparere* and the adjective *thverr* = *tranversus* with its adverb *thverz* = *transversim* (vid. *Edd. Sœmund.* Vol. II. *Spec. Gloss.* pp. 859, 860). In the cognate languages we find the same change in this word as in the *cver* and *sver* of the Etruscans: for while the Icelandic *thverr*, Engl. *thwart*, Dan. *tver*, Germ. *zwerch*, exhibit the dental more or less assibilated as in *sver*, the German *quer* and English *queer* give us a guttural instead of a sibilant as in *cver*. The appearance of *cver* or *sver* in sepulchral inscriptions (for we have *sver* in one beginning with *eca suthi*, Vermiglioli, p. 73), would lead us to suppose that this word or these words must refer to death or prostration, and this is a meaning included in the Icelandic word, whether or not connected with *var*, "male," "parum." The forms of *thverra*, when passive, are *ek thverr, thvarr, thorinn;* when active, *ek thverra, thverda:* and *thurr, thurt, thyrrinn*, signify "aridus," "siccus," like the German *durr*. Without stopping to ask whether these latter forms are derived in any way from the verb *thverr*, which is quite possible, it is worthy of remark that in those sepulchral inscriptions, in which the word *cver* or *sver* does not occur, we have in corresponding places the word *thaure, thurasi* (Vermigl. p. 64), *thuras, thaura, thuruni* (*Inscr. Per.* ll. 6, 20, 41). And in one old epitaph (Lanzi, *Saggio*, II. p. 97, no. 12) we find: *mi suthi L. Felthuri thura*, where the position of the last word almost leads us to render it: "I am the lamentation for L. Felthurius *deceased*." The inferences derivable from the appearance of these forms is that connected words significant of decay, prostration, and death, and liable to the same modification, *probably* existed both in Old

Norse and in Etruscan. The amount of probability depends upon the cumulative effect of the other evidence[1].

§ 9. *Striking coincidence between Etruscan and Old Norse in the use of the auxiliary verb* LATA.

Whatever may be thought of the verbal resemblances between the Old Norse and the language of the Etruscan fragments, it must be admitted by all sound philologers that we have an indisputable proof of the affinity of these idioms in the grammatical identity which I communicated to the British Association[2]. Every reader of the Runic inscriptions must have noticed the constant occurrence of the auxiliary or causative verb *lata* = *facere in causa esse*, of which the *Eddas* give us the forms *ek læt, let, latinn.* Thus we find: *Lithsmother lit hakva stein aufti Julibirn fath,* i. e. "Lithsmother *let* engrave a stone after (in memory of) his father Julibirn." *Thorstin lit gera merki stir Suin fathur sin,* i. e. "Thorstin *let* carve marks in memory of his father Sweyn." *Ulfktil uk Ku uk Uni thir litu raisa stin iftir Ulf fathur sin,* i. e. "Ulfktil and Ku and Uni, they *let* raise a stone in memory of their father Ulf" (vide Dieterich, *Runen-Sprach-Schatz,* p. 372). Now we have here, as part of a constantly-recurring phraseology, an auxiliary verb, signifying "to let" or "cause" followed by an infinitive in *-a*. On reading the first line of the longest Etruscan inscription, that of Perugia, we seem to stumble at once upon this identical phraseology, for we find: *eu lat tanna La Rezul amev achr lautn Velthinas.* If we had no other reason for supposing that there was some connexion between the Scandinavians and Etruscans, we could not avoid being struck by this apparent identity of construction. As, however, we have every reason to expect resemblances between the two languages, it becomes a matter of importance to inquire whether the grammatical identity can be established, and this amounts to the proof that *lat* and *tanna* are both verbs.

---

[1] I may mention in passing that *suer* actually occurs in Runic inscriptions in the sense "father-in-law;" thus: *iftir Kuthrikr suer sin* (Dieterich, *Runen-Sprsch.* p. 265); but that I do not regard this as more than an accidental coincidence with the expressions under consideration.

[2] *Report,* 1851, p. 158.

Of course there is no *primâ facie* reason to conclude that *tanna* is a verb. On the contrary, Niebuhr (*Kleine Schriften*, II. p. 40) thinks that *thana* is a noun signifying "a lady," and that *Tanaquil* is only a diminutive of it; and Passeri, whom he quotes, suggests that *Thana* is a title of honour, nearly equivalent in meaning, though not of course in origin, to the modern Italian *Donna* (from *domina*). Fortunately, however, about the time when this comparison between the Runic and Etruscan phraseology first occurred to me, Mr J. H. Porteus Oakes returned from a tour in Italy, and presented to the Museum at Bury St Edmund's a small patera or saucer, which he had obtained at Chiusi, and which exhibits the following legend: *stem tenilaeth nfatia.* This at once furnished me with the means of proving that *lat tanna* in the Perugian Inscription were two verbs, the latter being an infinitive and the former an auxiliary on which it depends. For it is obvious that *tenilaeth* is the third person of a transitive verb, the nominative being *Nfatia*, probably the name of a woman (cf. *Caphatial* = *Cafatia natus* in Dennis's bilingual inscription, II. p. 475), and the accusative being *stem* for *istam*, Umbr. *est-* (cf. *mi* with *e-mi*, &c.). The verb *tenilaeth* manifestly belongs to the same class of forms as the agglutinate or weak-perfects in Gothic, which are formed by the affix of the causative *da*, as *soki-da*, "I did seek" (Gabelentz u. Löbe, *Goth. Gramm.* § 127). We have this Gothic formation in the Latin *ven-do*, *pen-do*, &c.; and I have discussed in a subsequent chapter the remarkable causatives in *-so*, *-sivi*, as *arces-so*, *capes-so*, *quæ-so*, &c. It is clear then that *lat tanna* represents as separate words what *tenilaeth* exhibits in an agglutinate form. In the latter case the auxiliary is in the present tense, which in Gothic is formed in *th;* and *lat* is a strong perfect. There is no difficulty about the meaning of *tanna*, *teni*, which are clearly identical with the Icelandic *thenia* = *tendere*, O. H. G. *danjan*, *denjan*, A. S. *dhenjan*, N. H. G. *dehnen*, Gr. τείνω, ταννύω, Sanscr. *tan-*, and therefore signify "to offer," like the Latin *porrigo* or *porricio*. If this is the true explanation of the root when it occurs as a verb, we may reasonably apply the same interpretation to its use as a noun. In this use it appears under all the different forms *Thana*, *Thania*, *Thasna*, *Tania*, *Tannia*, *Dana*, and *Tha* (Müller, *Etrusk.* II. 303, 315). From the collocation it is clear that the

word is equivalent to *phleres*, or rather it signifies "an offering" generally, without the implication of a vow or prayer. Thus, while we have in the only urn with an inscription among the Etruscan specimens in the rooms adjoining the Egyptian collection in the British Museum: *thana celia cumniza*, we find on one of Lanzi's (*Saggio*, II. 506. no. 15): *mi thana Arntha*, which is quite analogous to *mi phleres* or *mi suthi*. It is worthy of remark that *ten-do*, which is an agglutinate form like *tenilata*, is synonymous with *porrigo;* thus we have in Cicero (*de Oratore*, I. 40. § 184): "præsidium clientibus atque opem amicis et prope cunctis civibus lucem ingenii et consilii sui *porrigentem* atque *tendentem;*" and we may compare such phrases as *duplices tendens ad sidera palmas* with *porrigit exta manus*, and the like. Even the Umbrian has *pur-tin-sus = por-rexeris* (*Eug. Tab.* I. b, 33). In ritual phraseology therefore the Latin language comes sufficiently near the language of this patera, and *stem tenilaeth Nfatia* bears as close a resemblance to *istam tendit* (vel *porrigit*) *Nefatia*, as we have any right to expect. The Perugian inscription, however, is even nearer to the Runic than this patera legend is to the Latin; and the evidence furnished by the two, taken together, seems to be quite conclusive in proof of the affinity between the Etruscan and Old Norse languages. As *lautn* and *lautnescle* occur together on another Etruscan sepulchre, there can be no objection to connect them with the Icelandic *laut = lacuna, locus depressus et defossus;* and *eu* from *is* is strictly analogous to the Latin *ceu* from *ce, cis;* accordingly, comparing *amev* with the Icelandic *ama = ango*, the beginning of the Perugian Inscription will be rendered as naturally and easily as one of the Runes: "Here Lartius the son of Ræsia let offer or give a field of mourning as or for the grave of Velthina." To return to the *patera*, its companion, now in the possession of Mr Beckford Bevan, bears a legend which is also capable of translation by the help of the Old Norse. The words are: *flenim thekinthl thmtflaneth.* It is obvious that we have here the name of a man, a transitive verb, and the accusative of the object, which is an open patera or saucer. As therefore in Icelandic *flenna = hiatus, chasma*, we may explain *flenim* by an immediate reference to the proper meaning of *patera* from *pateo:* cf. *patulus;* and as in Icelandic *tham = egelida obscuritas aeris; tef = morari;* and *lana = mutuum*

dare, credere, commodare, Engl. "lend," the compound verb *tham-tef-lan-eth* will mean "he *lendeth* for a dark dwelling," and the whole inscription will run thus: *Thekinthul dat pateram ad commorandum in tenebris.* Verbs compounded of nouns and verbs are not uncommon in Icelandic; thus we have *halshoggra,* "to behead," *brennimerkjâ,* "to brand," &c. It only remains to remark, that as the Gothic auxiliary *-do* is found in Latin, so the Norse *lata* must be recognised in a fainter form in some Latin verbs in *-lo,* as well as in the Sclavonic formations in *-l,* and in the Old Norse diminutives or frequentatives in *-la,* such as *rug-la,* "to turn upside down," from *rugga,* "to remove," *tog-la,* "to let chew," or "chew over again," from *tyggja,* &c.

§ 10. *The great Perugian Inscription critically examined—its Runic affinities.*

The facility with which the philologist dissects the Etruscan words which have been transmitted to us, either with an interpretation, or in such collocation as to render their meaning nearly certain, and the striking and unmistakable coincidences between the most difficult fragments and the remains of the Old Norse language, might well occasion some surprise to those who are told that there exists a large collection of Etruscan inscriptions which cannot be satisfactorily explained. One cause of the unprofitableness of Tuscan inscriptions is to be attributed to the fact, that these inscriptions, being mostly of a sepulchral or dedicatorial character, are generally made up of proper names and conventional expressions. Consequently they contribute very little to our knowledge of the Tuscan syntax, and furnish us with very few forms of inflexion. So far as I have heard, we have no historical or legal inscriptions. Those which I have inspected for myself are only monumental epitaphs and the dedications of offerings.

These observations might be justified by an examination of all the inscriptions which have been hitherto published. It will be sufficient, however, in this place to show how much or how little can be done by an analysis of the great inscription which was discovered in the neighbourhood of Perugia in the year 1822. This inscription is engraved on two sides of a block of

stone, and consists of forty-five lines in the whole; being by far the most copious of all the extant monuments of the Tuscan language. The writing is singularly legible, and the letters were coloured with red paint.

The following is an accurate transcript of the facsimiles given by Micali (*Tav.* CXX. no. 80) and Vermiglioli (*Antiche Iscrizioni Perugine*, ed. 2, p. 85).

25. *velthinaś.*
26. *atena . zuk-*
27. *i . eneski . ip-*
28. *a . śpelane .*
29. *this . fulumch-*
30. *va . śpel . thi-*
31. *rene . thi . eśt.*
32. *ak . velthina*
33. *ak . ilune .*
34. *turunesk .*
35. *unezea . zuk-*
36. *i . eneski . ath-*
37. *umicś . afu-*
38. *naś . penthn-*
39. *a . ama . velth-*
40. *ina . afun .*
41. *thuruni . ein .*
42. *zeriunak . ch-*
43. *a . thil . thunch-*
44. *ulthl . ich . ka .*
45. *kechazi . chuch-*
46. *e .*

1. *eu . lat . tanna . la . rezul .*
2. *amev . achr . lautn . velthinaś . e-*
3. *-śt . la . afunaś . slel . eth . karu-*
4. *tezan . fuśleri . tesnś . teiś .*
5. *raśneś . ipa . ama . hen . naper .*
6. XII . *velthina . thuraś . araś . pe-*
7. *raś . kemulmleskul . zuki . en-*
8. *eski . epl . tularu .*
9. *auleśi . velthinaś . arznal . kl-*
10. *enśi . thii . thilś . kuna . kenu . e-*
11. *plk . felik . larthalś . afuneś .*
12. *klen . thunchulthe .*
13. *falaś . chiem . fuśle . velthina .*
14. *hintha . kape . muniklet . masu .*
15. *naper . śrankzl . thii . falśti . v-*
16. *elthina . hut . naper . penezś .*
17. *masu . aknina . klel . afuna . vel-*
18. *thinam . lerzinia . intemam . e-*
19. *r . knl . velthina . ziaś . atene .*
20. *tesne . eka . velthina . thuraś . th-*
21. *aura . helu . tesne . raśne . kei .*
22. *tesnś . teiś . raśneś . chimth . śp .*
23. *el . thutaś . kuna . afunam . ena .*
24. *hen . naper . ki . knl . hareutuśe .*

Now, if we go through this inscription, and compare the words of which it is composed, we shall find that out of more than eighty different words there are very few which are not

obviously proper names, and some of these occur very frequently; so that this monument, comparatively copious as it is, furnishes, after all, only slender materials for a study of the Tuscan language. According to the most probable division of the words, the contents of the inscription may be considered as given in the following vocabulary:

Achr (2).
Afun (40).
Afuna (17).
Afunam (23).
Afunaś (3, 37).
Afuneś (11).
Ak (32, 33).
Aknina (17).
Ama (5, 39).
Amev (2).
Araś (6).
Arznal (9).
Atena (26).
Atene (19).
Athumicś (36).
Auleśi (9).
Cha (42).
Chiem (13).
Chimth (22).
Chuche (45).
Einzeriunak (42).
Eka (20).
Ena (23).
Eneski (7, 27).
Epl (11).
Eplt (8).
Er (18).
Eśt (2, 31).
Eth (3).
Eu (1).
Falaś, *falśti* (13, 15).
Felik (11).
Fulumchva (29).
Fuśle, *fuśleri* (13, 4).
Hareutuze (24).
Helu (21).
Hen (5, 24).
Hintha (14).
Hut (16).
Ich (44).
Ilune (33).
Intemam (18).
Ipa (5, 27).
Ka (44).
Kape (14).
Karutezan (4).
Kechazi (45).
Kei (21).
Kemulmleskul (7).
Kenu (10).
Ki (24).
Klel (17).
Klen, *klenśi* (9, 12).
Knl (19, 24).
Kuna (10, 23) ["a wife," Dieterich, *Runen-Sprsch.* p. 117.]
La (1, 3).
Larthalś (11).
Lat (1).
Lautn (2).
Lerzinia (18).
Masu (14, 17).
Muniklet (14).
Naper (5, 15, 16, 24).
Penezś (16).
Penthna (38).
Peraś (6).
Raśne, *Raśneś* (5, 21, 22).

Rezul (1).
Slel (3).
'Spel, śpelane (22, 28, 30).
'Srankzl (15).
Tanna (1).
Teiś (4, 22).
Tesne, tesnś (5, 20, 21, 22).
Thaura (20).
Thi, this, thii, thil, thilś (29, 31, 10, 43).
'Thuraś, thirene, thuruni (6, 30, 41.)
Thunchulthe (12).
Thunchulthl (43).
Thutaś (23).
Tularu (8).
Turunesk (34).
Velthina, Velthinaś, Velthinam (6, 13, 15, 19, 20, 32, 39, 2, 9, 25, 17).
Unezea (35).
Ziaś (19) [*Zia* "an aunt" in Modern Tuscan.]
Zuki (7, 26, 35).

The first remark to be made respecting this inscription is, that though we have here obviously a different language from that in which the Eugubine Tables are written, still there are many words which in outward form at least resemble the Umbrian phrases. Thus we have *eu* (v. 1), *velthina* (passim), *eśt* (2), *karu-* (3), *tesnś* (4), *kape* (14), *muniklet* (14), *turu-* (24), *einzeriu-* (41), &c., which may be compared with *eu, veltu, est, karu, tesenakes, kapi, muneklu, tures, anzeriatu,* &c., in the Eugubine Tables, though it does not at all follow that there is any similarity of meaning in addition to the mere assonance. The word *naper* (5, 15, 16, 24) seems to have the termination *-per*, so common in Umbrian: we may compare it with the Latin *nu-per* (*pro novo*). But although no profitable results can be expected from a comparison between syllables occurring in this inscription and others of similar sound picked at random from the Eugubine Tables, something might be done if we had a large number of smaller inscriptions, written in the same language, derived from the same neighbourhood, and treating in different ways on the same or kindred subjects. To show this I will quote another Perugian inscription, and place side by side in a parallel column the words or phrases of the great inscription which seem to correspond. The text which I have adopted is that of Vermiglioli, (p. 64). The inscription was first copied by Bonarota in his supplement to Dempster, (p. 98)[1]. It was

[1] Bonarota describes the inscription as *adhuc exstans in antiquo ædificio ad modum turris lapidibus grandioribus exstructo et vocatur* "S. Manno." Amaduzzi says it comes *ex hypogæo Perusino.*

also quoted many years ago, with great inaccuracy, by Amaduzzi (*Alphabetum Veterum Etruscorum*, Rom. 1775. p. lxi.):

l. 1.	
cehen . suthi . hinthiu . thues . sains : Etve : thaure . lautnescle . caresri . Aules . Larthia . precu-thurasi.	*hintha* (14) *lautn* (2) *thuras* (6)
l. 2.	
Larthial . svle . Cestnal . clen . erasi . eth . Phanl . lautn . precus . ipa . murzua cerurum . ein	*aras* (6) *eth* (3) *lautn* (2) *ipa* (5, 27) *ena* (23)
l. 3.	
heczri . tunur . cl . utiva telur.	

In another inscription quoted by Vermiglioli (p. 73) we have *caratse* by the side of *carutezan* (4), which must be compared with *hareutuse* (24). The starting-point for a profitable comparison between the Perugian Inscription and that just quoted is furnished by an examination of *caratse, carutezan, hareutuze,* and the word *caresri* in the document before us. We have seen above (p. 125) that in the Oscan language *-tuset* or *-tuzet* occurs as an auxiliary affix to verbs, in the same way as *-do* and *-so* = *-sino* are used in Latin, *-do* in Gothic, and *lata* in Old Norse and Etruscan. There is every reason, then, to suppose that the forms *cara-tse, caru-tezan, hareu-tuze,* involve the affix *tuzet,* or that the Etruscan agrees with the Latin, Gothic, and Oscan, in the use of the auxiliary *-do.* As the Etruscan also agrees with the Old Norse in the use of the auxiliary *lata,* which probably occurs also in Sclavonian and Latin forms, we may be led to expect a similar coincidence in regard to the auxiliary *so=sino.* Now it will be shown in the proper place that the isolated form *sero, sevi,* is only a by-form of *sino, sivi,* the primary meaning of both being "to put" or "lay down," i.e. as seed in the ground. In Old Norse *sero,* in the sense "I sow," is represented by *sôa,* which has a peculiar aorist *sera, 3* pers. *seri.* These Old Norse aorists, such as *grôa* "to grow;" aorist sing. 1. *gréra,* 2. *grérir,*

3. *gréri;* pl. 1. *grérum,* 2. *grérut,* 3. *gréru,* &c., have been made the subject of special commentaries by Aufrecht and Knoblauch (*Zeitschr. f. Vergl. Sprf.* 1851, pp. 471, 573), who agree in identifying the *r* with the *s* of ἔτυψα and *scripsi,* and this again with the substantive verb. Whatever opinion may be formed respecting the origin of this *r* (and the verb *pi-rut* from *pi* = *fio,* shows that it cannot be derived from the contrasted *es-se*), it is impossible to overlook the fact that *seri* is, in Old Norse, a past tense of a verb really identical with that which constitutes the causative auxiliary in so many Latin forms. So that *care-sri* would be quite equivalent to *care-tuzet.* The root is found under the form *kar, kra, gra,* mostly with a labial *auslaut* (as in *scrib-o,* γράφ-ω), but sometimes without (as in זָכַר, above, p. 147, χαρ-άσσω), and sometimes either with or without, as in the Icelandic *kira, gera, kiera, kiara, kara, kerva* (Dieterich, *Runen-Sprsch.* p. 134), N. H. G. *kerben,* A. S. *ceorfan,* Engl. "carve," to signify any impression made upon a surface by notching, scratching, indenting, painting, or pointing. We may well conclude therefore that *care-sri* means, "he caused to write or inscribe." And as *thyr* in Icelandic is = *serv-us,* Greek θής, A. S. *theov,* M. G. *thiûs,* and *thues* is obviously the gen. of a word *thu* = *theov,* the beginning of the inscription runs as if it were pure Low-German or some dialect of the Scandinavian. "Here Aulus Lartius let engrave mourning in honour of" (lit. 'after,' *hinthiu* = *hinter,* cf. *aufti* in the Runic Inscription quoted above, p. 177) "his servant Etfus on the sepulchral tomb," i. e. "hier sut hinter theovs seins Etfa thaure lautnescle lat kara Aules Larthia." We should come, however, to a similar conclusion if *thu-es* were compared with the Pelasgo-Hellenic θεῖος, "an uncle," rather than with θής, "a servant." In fact, the two words fall into a remarkable agreement with one another and with the Pelasgic and German words denoting divinity; cf. (a) *thyr, theov, dio,* &c. "a servant," (b) θεῖος, modern Tuscan *zio,* (Perug. Inscr. *zia*) "an uncle," (c) *Tyr, Tiv, Zio,* "God," (Grimm. *D. M.* p. 175, and above, p. 108, s. v. *Famel*). To say nothing of the possible interchange in the ideas of relationship and servitude which might bring back θεῖος and θής, to a common origin in the Sanscrit *dhava*=*vir, maritus, pater-familias,* the form of the word θεῖος in its other meaning sufficiently shows that a labial is absorbed, and this would

account for the identity of θεῖ-ος = θέϝος, and the Etruscan *thu*. For the gen. here, cf. *Tues* in our *Tues-day* with its original form *Tiv* = *Div-us*. The name of a relation is more to be expected here than that of a servant. The preposition *hinthiu*, with the gen. may be compared with the Gothic use of *hindana*, e. g. *Ulph. Mc.* III. 8. That this root occurred in the Umbrian we have already seen (above, p. 85). As *l* and *u* are constantly confused in the transcripts of Tuscan inscriptions, it might be better to write *hinthil* for *hinthiu*, and this would come nearer to *hinter*, *hindan*, &c. With regard to the form of the pronoun *sain*, as compared with *sein* or *sin*, it may be remarked that in the Runic inscriptions we have *sain*, *san*, *sian*, as well as *sin*, (Dieterich, p. 289), and that we have *stain*, as well as *sten*, *stein*, *stin*, (Dieterich, p. 308). I recognise a form like *caresri* in *heczri*, the other verb in this inscription, which may obviously be connected with the Runic *haka* or *hakva*, "to hew or carve," (above, p. 177), and this being so, it would be a surprising coincidence, if it were only a coincidence, that these three lines should contain two of the verbs which appear in the same way in the Runic inscriptions; as *Lithsmother lit hakva stein;* and *Thorstin lit gera merki stir Suin fathur sin;* or both together, as, *Inkuth lat landtbro kiara ante stain hakva.* The last part of the inscription is mutilated: but it seems plain that *ipa* is a preposition corresponding to our *up*, Sanscrit *upa*, Icelandic *uppâ*, Gothic *uf*, &c.; and as *murzva* seems to refer to *murus*, Icel. *mur*, a term well applicable to the tower "*grandioribus lapidibus exstructa*," on which this inscription was found, we may render *heczri ipa murzva*, "he let carve upon the building." And it is difficult to resist the impression that *cerurum* is connected with the Old Norse *ker=vas*, which is used in the *Edda* in the sense of *vasarium* (*Sæmund.* II. p. 528): "Gudrum hvarf til skemmo, kumbl konúnga or *kerom* valdi," i. e. "Gudruna contulit se ad promptuarium, cristas regias e *vasariis* delegit." If this comparison is valid, *cerurum* is a genitive plural. In some Runic inscriptions *ein*, which immediately follows, is used as a definite article before an epithet; as: *Sandulf ein suarti*, "Sandulf the swarthy" (Worsaae, *Danes and Norwegians in England*, &c. p. 281). The last word *telur*, whether or not related to *tularu* or the Perugian *cippus* (l. 8), seems to be a verb, not unconnected with the Icelandic *at teliâ*, Swed. *taeljâ*, Dutch *tellen*, Engl. *tell*,

the inflexion being that of the Icelandic 3 pers. sing., as in *brennr*, "he burns," from *brenna*. On an urn in the British Museum, in the same room with the Nineveh sculptures, we find *tulati* on a mutilated inscription; and *ris-ti* or *rais-ti*, "he erected," on the Runic stones, might justify the assumption that it is a verb; but it is impossible to form any plausible conjecture as to its signification.

If we now turn back from the inscription, which has thus been examined, to the great Perugian *cippus*, we shall see that some definite conclusions result from the comparison. First of all, as they are obviously written in the same language, the strong resemblances between the phraseology of the shorter legend and that of the Icelandic Runes must confirm our previous conviction respecting the Old Norse affinities of the longer inscription. Again, as *hinthiu* and *ipa* are manifestly prepositions in the former, we may give a similar value to *hintha* and *ipa* in the latter. And as *ipa* is used with the name of a building in the shorter epitaph, *ama* which follows it on the *cippus*, and which seems in the first line to refer to mourning or sorrow, must signify an erection for such a purpose, and therefore the *amev achr* of the first line must mean a field for the erection of a tomb. The word *ama* also occurs in a very imperfect inscription quoted by Dennis (I. p. 342). Lastly, as we have both *lautn* and *lautnescle* in the shorter inscription by the side of *lautn* in the larger, we may infer that *lautnescle* is a diminutive form like *munusculum*, and therefore we may compare *kemul-mleskul* in the Perugian inscription with *kuml*, the regular Runic name for a monumental stone (Dieterich, *Runen-Sprach-Schatz*, p. 124).

With regard to the general interpretation of the Perugian inscription, it seems idle to follow in the steps of the Italian scholars, Vermiglioli, Orioli, and Campanari, the last of whom has given us a Latin translation of the whole inscription. Nor can I sympathise in the regret of Dr. C. Von Schmitz, when he complains that he cannot find a publisher for the grammar and dictionary of the Etruscan, which are to explain his forced and unnatural version of this document (*Zeitschr. f. d. Alterthumsw.* 1846, *Septemb. Beilage*). It would, indeed, be easy to found a number of conjectures on the assonances which may be detected in almost every line; but until a complete collection of all the genuine Etruscan inscriptions shall have furnished us with a sufficiently wide field for our researches,—until every extant Tuscan word has been brought within the reach of a

philological comparison,—we must be content to say of this great Perugian inscription, that it appears to be a *cippus* conveying some land for funereal purposes[1]. The donor is Larthius, a member of the family of the *Reza* (*Rœsii*), who were distinguished people in the neighbourhood of Perusia (see Vermiglioli, *Iscriz. Perug.* p. 273), and *Rasne*, which occurs thrice in the inscription, seems to be a patronymic of the same family. The relative position of the word, no less than the locality of the inscription, shows that *Velthina* is the person in whose honour this *cippus* was erected, and that the word does not refer to *Felsina*, the old name of *Bononia* (Plin. *H. N.* III, 20. XXXIII, 37. XXXVII. 57. Serv. *ad Æn.* X. 198). The other personal name, which occurs most frequently in the inscription is *Afuna*, probably *Aponia* (Vermiglioli, p. 233); and it is worthy of remark, that we have the nom., gen., and accus. of these two proper names in accordance with the regular forms of the first Latin declension,—namely,—*Afuna*, *Afunas*, *Afunam*, and *Velthina*, *Velthinas*, *Velthinam*. The name *Velthina* may be compared with the well-known name *Cœcina*. From the prænomen *Aulesi* in v. 9. it is probably a man's name[2]. If I do not undertake to interpret all that Lartius, the son of Ræsia, has thought fit to inscribe on this *cippus*, it must not be supposed that this in any way affects the results at which I have arrived respecting the ethnography of the Etruscans. That an inability to interpret Runic monuments may be perfectly consistent with a knowledge of the class of languages to which they belong, is shown, not merely by the known relationship between the language of the Egyptian hieroglyphics, and the Coptic dialects more recently spoken in that country, but still more strikingly by the fact, that, although we have no doubt as to any of the idioms spoken in ancient Britain, no one has been able as yet to give a certain interpretation of the Runic inscriptions on the

---

[1] See the commentators on Hor. I. *Serm.* VIII. 13; and the *bon mot* of Augustus on Vettius *quum monumentum patris exarasset* (Macrob. II. *Sat.* c. 4. p. 232).

[2] We have seen above that the termination *-l* indicates a matronymic; and I conclude that the Etruscan patronymic ended in *-na*; compare in this inscription, *Rezul* with *Rasna*, and *Cœci-lia*, which was the Roman equivalent to the mythical Tanaquil, with the undoubtedly Tuscan form *Cœci-na*. I do not agree with Müller (*Etr.* I. p. 453) that the forms in *-si*, as *Aulesi*, *Clensi*, are datives.

pillar at Bewcastle and on the font at Bridekirk, which are both in Cumberland, and which both belong to the same dialect of the Low-German languages, (see Palgrave, *History of the Anglo-Saxons,* Lond. 1850, pp. 146. sq.). The really important point is to determine the origin of the ancient Etruscans; and the Perugian inscription, so far from throwing any difficulties in the way of the conclusion at which I have arrived, has furnished some of the strongest and most satisfactory confirmations of the Old Norse affinity of the Rasena.

§ 11. *Harmony between linguistic research and ethnographic tradition in regard to the ancient Etruscans.*

This survey of the Etruscan language, brief and circumscribed as it necessarily is, has enabled us to perceive that there is a perfect harmony and agreement between the results of our linguistic researches, so far as the scanty materials have allowed us to carry them, and the ethnographic and historic traditions respecting the ancient Etruscans. We have seen that in the character of their writing, in most of their mythology, in by far the greatest number of those words which have been transmitted to us with an interpretation, and in the oldest inscriptions, especially in those from Cære, there are decisive evidences of an affinity between the inhabitants of Etruria and those Pelasgians who peopled Greece in the earliest times, and who constituted an important element in the inhabitants of Latium. For the residue of the language, and especially in the case of those inscriptions which are found near Clusium and Perugia, we are enabled to recognise an ingredient unmistakably identical with that Scandinavian dialect, which Norwegian emigrants conveyed in an ancient form to the inaccessible regions of *ultima Thule,* where it remained for centuries safe from all risk of corruption or improvement by an infusion of foreign words or constructions. Now these phenomena, as we have seen, are necessary to reconcile, and do in fact reconcile, all the traditions about the inhabitants of Etruria. The Pelasgian affinities of the old Tyrrhenians are attested by the concurring voice of all antiquity; and as in Argolis, so in Italy, we shall best understand the statement that a more complete civilization was imported directly from Lydia, if we bear in mind that the Lydians referred to in the tradition were Pelasgians, who had appropriated the arts and social culture

of their Asiatic neighbours. And we shall be able to adopt this universal belief of a connexion between the western coasts of Asia Minor and Italy, without disturbing the well-grounded statement that the Rasena and Ræti were one and the same race, if we infer that these Rasena were a much later ingredient, and one which only established an aristocracy of conquest in the cities of Etruria, without permanently or extensively affecting the great mass of the population. It will be observed that the main obstacle to a general reception of the statement that the Rasena were Rætians has consisted in the apparent inconsistency between this and the Lydian tradition. The ethnographical inversion, by which Livy makes the Rætians the fugitive offshoot of a nation which really descended from their own mountains, has not occasioned any difficulty. It would be admitted at once that, if the Rætians and Rasena were one and the same people, some foreign interference must have disturbed the continuity of their area in the valley of the Po, and if there was once an unbroken stream of population from the Lech to the Tiber, no ethnographer will doubt that its source must have been in the mainland rather than in the peninsula. But it has not been sufficiently considered, that the bulk of the Pelasgian nation, already settled in Umbria and Etruria, would not lose their original type, merely because they were invaded and conquered by a band of warriors from the north, any more than Anglo-Saxon England was entirely deprived of its former characteristics by the Norman inroad. The civilization of the Tyrrhenians, their connexion with the commercial activity of the Mediterranean[1], and the advantages which they derived from the arts and social culture of their brethren in Asia Minor, were circumstances long anterior to the invasion from the north; and as the Rasena would adopt the refinements which they found among the Tyrrhenians, we may make ingenious comparisons between the tombs of Porsena[2] and Alyattes, without refusing our assent to the well-attested fact that the

[1] It is to this that I would attribute the continuance of Hellenic influences, on which Müller insists (*Etrusk.* II. 292).

[2] It is worthy of remark, that a distinguishing feature in the monument of Porsena, as described by Varro (*apud Plin.* XXXIV. 13), namely, the bells on the cupolas, is expressly compared with a similar contrivance at the *Pelasgian* Dodona: "tintinnabula, quæ vento agitata longe sonitus referant, *ut Dodonæ olim factum.*"

warriors and city-nobles of historical Etruria derived their origin from the Rætian Alps. With regard to the argument from the remains of the Etruscan language, the philologer will at once admit that, as far as it goes, the evidences of affinity, which have been adduced, are neither precarious nor doubtful. Instead of conjectures founded on a casual agreement of syllables, we have seen that the meaning, which we were led to expect, was at once supplied by the language, which collateral circumstances had indicated as the proper source of information; and not only were ethnical names and common words simply and consistently explained in this way, but we found that some peculiarities of etymology and syntax were at once illustrated by a reference to the same standard of comparison. So that, on the whole, every available resource of grammar and philology tends to confirm and reconcile the otherwise divergent and contradictory statements of ancient history; and the Etruscans may now without any inconsistency claim both the Tyrrheno-Lydian and Rætian affinities, which the classical writers have attributed to them.

§ 12. *General remarks on the absorption or evanescence of the old Etruscan Language.*

It only remains that I should make a few remarks on the absorption or evanescence of the old Etruscan language. When we see so much that is easily explained; when, in fact, there is no great difficulty in dealing with any Etruscan word which has come down to us with an interpretation or clue to its meaning; and when we are puzzled only by inscriptions, which are in themselves mere fragments, made up in a great measure of proper names, and mutilated by, we know not how many, conventional abbreviations, it is sufficiently evident that the striking differences between the Etruscan and the other ancient dialects of the peninsula were not such as to take the language out of the Indo-Germanic family, and that while these differences affected only an inconsiderable ingredient in the old Etruscan, the main portion of the language must have approximated very closely to the contiguous and surrounding idioms. Otherwise, we should be obliged to ask, where is the bulk of that language which was spoken by the ancestors of Mæcenas? We talk of dead languages; but this variety of human speech should seem to be not only dead, but buried, and not only buried, but sunk

beneath the earth in some necropolis, into which no Galassi or Campanari can dig his way. The standard Italian of the present day is the offspring of that Latinity which was spoken by the Etrusco-Romans; but we find no trace of ancient barbarism in any Tuscan writer. Surely it is a fair inference, that while the Rætian element, introduced into the northern cities by an aristocracy of conquest, was not permanently influential, but was absorbed, like the Norman French in this country, by the Pelasgo-Umbrian language of the bulk of the population, the latter, which may be termed "the common Etruscan," like the Sabello-Oscan and other dialects, merged in the old Latin, not because the languages were unlike, but because they were sister idioms, and embraced one another as soon as they had discovered their relationship[1]. The only way to escape from all the difficulties of this subject is to suppose that the city on the Tiber served as a centre and rallying point for the languages of Italy as well as for the different tribes who spoke them, and that Rome admitted within her walls, with an inferior franchise, which in time completed itself, both the citizens and the vocabularies of the conquered Italian states. If this absorbing centralization could so thoroughly Latinize the Celtic inhabitants of Lombardy, and even the transalpine branch of the Gallic race, much more would it be likely to affect the Etruscans, who extended to the Tiber, and whose language, in its predominant or Pelasgian character, approximated so closely to the cognate idiom of the old Latin tribes.

---

[1] Among many instances of the possibility at least of such a transition, not the least interesting is the derivation of *Populonia* from *Phupluns*, the Etruscan Bacchus; so that this city, the Etruscan name of which was *Popluna*, is the Dionysopolis of Etruria (see Gerhard in the *Rhein. Mus.* for 1833, p. 135). Now it is clear that as *Nethuns* = *Nethu-nus*, is the god of *nethu*, so *Phupluns* = *Poplu-nus* is the god of *poplu*. It seems that the ancients planted the poplar chiefly on account of their vines, and the poplar was sacred to Hercules, who has so many points of contact with Bacchus. Have we not, then, in the word *phupluns* the root of *pôpulus*, a word quite inexplicable from the Latin language alone? A sort of young, effeminate Hercules, who appears on the coins of Populonia (see Müller, *Etrusk.* I. p. 331), is probably this *Poplunus*. The difference in the quantity of the first syllables of *Pôpulus* and *Pŏpulonia* is not surprising, as the latter is an exotic proper name, and the former a naturalized common term.

CHAPTER VI.

THE OLD ROMAN OR LATIN LANGUAGE.

§ 1. Fragments of old Latin not very numerous. § 2. Arvalian Litany. § 3. Chants preserved by Cato. § 4. Fragments of Salian hymns. § 5. Old regal laws. § 6. Remains of the XII. Tables. § 7. Table I. § 8. Table II. § 9. Table III. § 10. Table IV. § 11. Table V. § 12. Table VI. § 13. Table VII. § 14. Table VIII. § 15. Table IX. § 16. Table X. § 17. Table XI. § 18. Table XII. § 19. The Tiburtine Inscription. § 20. The epitaphs of the Scipios. § 21. The *Columna Rostrata*. § 22. The Silian and Papirian Laws and the edict of the Curule Ædiles. § 23. The *Senatus-Consultum de Bacchanalibus*. § 24. The old Roman law on the Bantine Table.

§ 1. *Fragments of Old Latin not very numerous.*

HAVING in the preceding chapters given specimens of the languages spoken by those nations which contributed in different proportions to the formation of the Roman people, the next step will be to collect the most interesting remains of the old Roman language,—considered as the offspring of the Umbrian, Oscan, and Tuscan,—such as it was before the predominance of Greek cultivation had begun to work on this rude composite structure. The total loss of the genuine Roman literature[1] will, of course, leave us but a scanty collection of such documents. Indeed, for the earlier centuries we have only a few brief fragments of religious and legal import. As we approach the Punic wars, the inscriptions become more numerous and complete; but then we are drawing near to a period when the Roman language began to lose its leading characteristics under the pressure of foreign influences, and when it differed little or nothing from that idiom which has become familiar to us from the so-called classical writings of the Augustan age.

Polybius, speaking of the ancient treaty between Rome and Carthage (III. 22), remarks that the old Latin language differed so much from that which was spoken in his own time, that the best-informed Romans could not make out some expressions without difficulty, even when they paid the greatest attention: *τηλικαύτη γὰρ ἡ διαφορὰ γέγονε τῆς διαλέκτου, καὶ παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις, τῆς νῦν πρὸς τὴν ἀρχαίαν, ὥστε τοὺς συνετωτάτους*

[1] See Macaulay, *Lays of Ancient Rome*, pp. 15, sqq.

ἔνια μόλις ἐξ ἐπιστάσεως διευκρινεῖν. The great mass of words must, however, have been susceptible of interpretation; for he does not shrink from translating into Greek the substance at least of that very ancient treaty.

§ 2. *Arvalian Litany.*

Accordingly, we find that the most primitive specimens of Latinity may now-a-days be understood by the scholar, who, after all, possesses greater advantages than Polybius and his contemporary Romans. This will appear if we examine the song of the *Fratres Arvales*, which is one of the most important and ancient specimens of the genuine Roman language. The inscription, in which it is preserved, and which was discovered in the year 1777, is probably not older than A. D. 218; but there is every reason to believe that the *cantilena* itself was the same which was sung in the earliest ages of Rome,—for these litanies very often survive their own significance. The monks read the Latin of their missals without understanding it, and the Parsees of Gujerat cannot interpret their sacred Zend. It appears from the introductory remarks, that this song was confined to the priests, the *Publici* being excluded: "Deinde subselliis marmoreis consederunt; et panes laureatos per Publicos partiti sunt; ibi omnes lumemulia cum rapinis acceperunt, et Deas unguentaverunt, et Ædes clusa est, omnes foris exierunt: ibi Sacerdotes clusi succincti, libellis acceptis, carmen descindentes tripodaverunt in verba hæc:

1. *Enos Lases juvate* (ter),
2. *Neve luaerve Marmar sins incurrere in pleoris* (ter)
3. *Satur furere* (vel *fufere*) *Mars limen salista berber* (ter)
4. *Semunis alternei* (vel *alternis?*) *advocapit conctos* (ter)
5. *Enos Marmor* (vel *Mamor*) *juvato* (ter)
6. *Triumpe, triumpe, triumpe, triumpe, triumpe.*

Post tripodationem, deinde signo dato Publici introiere, et libellos receperunt." (See Orelli, *Inscript. Lat.* I. p. 391, no. 2271.)

There can be little doubt as to the meaning of any single word in this old hymn, which seems to be written in very rude Saturnian verse, the first half of the verse being alone preserved in some cases; as in *Enós Lasés juváte—Enós Mamór juváto.* The last line is a series of trochees *cum anacrusi,* or a still shorter form of the first half of the Saturnian verse.

1. *Enos* is a form of the first person plural, analogous to the German *uns.* *Lases* is the old form of *Lares* (Quinctil. *Institut. Orat.* I. 4. § 13; see Müller *ad Fest.* p. 15).

2. *Luærve* for *luerve-m,* according to a custom of dropping the final M, which lasted till Cato's time (see next §). This form bears the same relation to *luem* that *Minerva* does to *mens.* *Caterva* from *catus* = *acutus* (above, p. 106), and its synonym *acervus* from *acus,* are derivatives of the same kind[1]. We may also compare *bovem, suem,* &c. with their older forms, *boverem, suerem,* &c. *Marmar, Marmor,* or *Mamor,* is the Oscan and Tuscan *Mamers,* i. e. *Mars* (above p. 146). That *Mars,* or *Mars pater,* was addressed as the averter of diseases, bad weather, &c. is clear from Cato, *R. R.* 141. *Sins* is *sinas:* so Tab. Bantin. l. 19: *Bantins* for *Bantinus,* &c. *Ple-ores* is the genuine comparative of *ple-nus,* which bears the same relation to πλεῖος that *unus* does to οἶος. The fullest form would be *ple-iores* = πλε-ίονες.

3. "O Mars, having raged to your satisfaction (comp. Hor. I. *Carm.* II. 37: "longo satiate ludo"), grant that the Sun's light may be warm." *Limen* for *lumen* may be com-

[1] Mr. F. W. Newman (*Regal Rome,* p. 61) derives *caterva* from the Welch *cad-torva,* "battle-troop." I do not know whether this etymology was suggested by the well-known statements in Vegetius, II. 2: "Galli Celtiberique pluresque barbaricæ nationes *catervis* utebantur in prœliis." Isidor. *Orig.* IX. 33: "proprie Macedonum phalanx, Gallorum *caterva,* nostra legio dicitur." Döderlein, who proposes (*Lat. Syn. u. Et.* V. 361) to connect *caterva* with *quattuor,* properly remarks that these passages do not show that *caterva* was considered a Gallic word, but only that, as distinguished from the *phalanx* and *legio,* it denoted a less completely disciplined body of men. The natural idea of a "heap" of separable objects is that of a mass piled up to a point, and this is indicated by the roots of *ac-er-vus* and *cat-er-va.* The latter therefore, as denoting a body of men, suggests the same arrangement as the *cuneus,* which is mentioned along with it by Tacitus, *Hist.* II. 42: "comminus eminus *catervis* et *cuneis* concurrebant." On the form of *cat-er-va,* see below, Ch. XIII. § 5.

pared with *plisima* for *plurima* (Fest. p. 205), *scripulum* for *scrupulum*, &c. (see below, § 5). *Salis* is the original form of *solis:* comp. σέλας, ἥλιος, *Au-selius*, &c. The Oscan and Etruscan usage of the auxiliary *ta* or *tu* "to cause" (above pp. 125, 129, 184), shows that Döderlein is right in reading *ta=da* instead of *sta* (*Lat. Syn. u. Et.* VI. 330). He quotes Hor. I. *Ep.* 16, 60: "*da* mihi fallere, *da* justo sanctumque videri," though he perceives that *ta* is connected with τίθημι rather than with δίδωμι. *Berber* is another form of *fervere.*

4. *Semuneis* is *semones*, i. e. *semihemones. Advocapit* is a contraction for *ad vos capite*—the *e* being omitted, as in *duc, fac, fer*, &c.—and it is probable that the phrase is equivalent to *adhibete in auxilium*, "call to your aid."

§ 3. *Chants preserved by Cato.*

The other extant religious compositions, though few and scanty, contribute to the same conclusion—that the oldest Latin was not so unlike the language with which we are familiar as to defy interpretation. Two relics of the same kind as the last have been preserved by Cato (*R. R.* 160), who writes thus: "Luxum si quod est, hac cantione sanum fiet. Harundinem prende tibi viridem p. iv. aut v. longam. Mediam diffinde, et duo homines teneant ad coxendices. Incipe cantare in alio: S[anum] F[iet]. In mota et soluta (vulg. *mota vœta*): *daries dardaries astataries*, dic sempiterno (vulg. *dissunapiter* or *dic una pariter*), usquedum coeant. . . . Ad luxum aut ad fracturam alliga, sanum fiet, et tamen quotidie cantato in alio: S. F. vel luxato: vel hoc modo: *havat, havat, havat: ista pista sista: domabo damnaustra et luxato.*" i. e. *haveat, haveat, haveat: istam pestem sistam: domabo damna vestra et luxatum* (see Grotefend, *Rud. L. Umbr.* IV. 13). With regard to the second *excantatio*, which is simple enough, it is only necessary to observe, that the final *m* is omitted both in the accusatives *luxato, pista*, &c. and in the future *sista;* and we are especially told that it was the custom with Cato the Censor to drop the *m* at the termination of the futures of verbs in *-o* and *-io:* thus he wrote *dice, facie*, for *dicam, faciam* (see Quinctil. *Inst. Or.* I. 7, § 23, and cf. IX. 4, § 39; Fest. p. 72. Müll.), *recipie* for *recipiam* (Fest. p. 286), *attinge* for *attingam* (id. p. 26), *ostende* for *ostendam* (id. p. 201), which are all quoted as common ex-

amples. He also omitted the *-s* of the nominative, as in *præfamino* for *præfaminus* (used for *præfato:* see *R. R.* 141: "Janum Jovemque vino *præfamino*, sic dicito." cf. 134; and see Fest. p. 87). The words *daries, dar-dar-ies, as-ta-tar-ies*, seem to be a jingling alliteration, the meaning of which must not be pressed too far; Pliny, at least (*H. N.* XVII. 28), does not think them worthy of serious attention; though Grotefend would compare them with *dertier dierir* in the spurious Umbrian inscription (see Leps. p. 52).

§ 4. *Fragments of the Salian Hymns.*

The Salian songs, if any considerable fragments of them had come down to our times, would have furnished us with very interesting specimens of ancient Latinity. Unfortunately they are all lost, with the exception of a few lines and detached words; and with them we have been deprived of the learned commentaries of Ælius Stilo, who was not, however, able to explain them throughout. Varro, VII. § 2: "Ælii, hominis in primo in litteris Latinis exercitati, interpretationem carminum Saliorum videbis et exili littera expeditam et præterita obscura multa[1]." Of the explanations of Ælius the following have been preserved. Festus, s. v. *Manuos*, p. 146: "*Manuos* in carminibus Saliaribus Ælius Stilo [*et Aurelius*, v. Paul. p. 147] significare ait *bonos:* unde Inferi Di *manes* pro *boni* dicantur a suppliciter eos venerantibus propter metum mortis, ut *immanes* quoque pro valde [non bonis] dicuntur." Id. s. v. *Molucrum*, p. 141: "Molucrum non solum quo molæ vertuntur dicitur, id quod Græci *μυληκόρον* appellant, sed etiam tumor ventris, qui etiam virginibus incidere solet....Cloatius etiam [*et Ælius*] in libris sacrorum molucrum esse aiunt lignum quoddam quadratum ubi immolatur. Idem Ælius in explanatione carminum Saliarium eodem nomine appellari ait, quod sub mola supponatur. Aurelius Opilius appellat ubi molatur." Id. s. v. *Pescia*, p. 210: "*Pescia* in Saliari carmine Ælius Stilo dici ait capitia ex pellibus agninis facta, quod Græci pelles vocent *πέσκη* [*πεσκέων, δερ-*

[1] Horace, too, alludes to the difficulty of the Salian songs (II. *Epist.* 1. 86):

> Jam saliare Numæ carmen qui laudat, et illud,
> Quod *mecum ignorat*, solus vult scire videri, &c.

μάτων, Hesych.] neutro genere pluraliter." Id. s. v. *Salias virgines*, p. 329: "Salias virgines Cincius ait esse conducticias, quæ ad Salios adhibeantur cum apicibus paludatas, quas Ælius Stilo scripsit sacrificium facere in Regia cum pontifice paludatas cum apicibus in modum Saliorum." There are other references in Festus to the philological interpretations of Ælius; but as the Salian songs are not mentioned in them, we have no right to assume that this particular commentary is quoted: see Festus, s. v. *Manias*, p. 129; s. v. *Monstrum*, p. 138; s. v. *Nebulo*, p. 165; s. v. *Naucum*, p. 166; s. v. *Nusciciosum*, p. 173; s. v. *Novalem agrum*, p. 174; s. v. *Ordinarium hominem*, p. 185; s. v. *Obstitum*, p. 193 (cf. pp. 248, 249); s. v. *Puticulos*, p. 217; s. v. *Portisculus*, p. 234; s. v. *Sonticum*, p. 290; s. v. *Subuculam*, p. 309; s. v. *Tongere*, p. 356; s. v. *Tamne* (= *eo usque*), p. 359; s. v. *Victimam*, p. 371.

The following are the remaining fragments of the Salian hymns.

Varro, *L. L.* VII. § 26: "In multis verbis, in quo antiqui dicebant s, postea dictum r; ut in carmine Saliorum sunt hæc:

> COZEULODOIZESO [vel *coreulodorieso*]; OMINA [enim] VERO AD PATULA COEMISSE [vel *oremisse*] JAMCUSIANES; DUONUSCERUSES DUNZIANUS VEVET."

This may be written as follows, in the Saturnian metre:

> *Chòraúloïdoŕ éso:* | *ómina énim véro*
> *'Ad pátula' óse' mísse* | *Jáni cúŕiónes.*
> *Dùónus Cérus ésit,* | *dúnque Jánus vévet.*

i. e. *choraulœdos sum* (= *esum*); *omina enimvero ad patulam aurem miserunt Jani curiones. Bonus Cerus* (i. e. *Cerus manus* = *creator bonus*, Fest. p. 122) *erit donec Janus vivet* (vide Grotefend, *Rud. L. Umbr.* II. p. 16).

With regard to the apparently Greek word *choŕoaulœdos*, it may be sufficient to quote an observation of Varges (*Rhein. Mus.* for 1835, p. 69), who, speaking of his derivation of *ampirvo* (see below) from ἄμπειρα, says: "Vix est quod moneam in Saliari carmine alia quoque vocabula inveniri, quæ originem Græcam manifesto præ se ferant, ut *pescia*, de quo vocabulo vide Fest. et Gutberl. [*de Saliis*], p. 146, et *tripudium*, quod propius esse Græcorum πόδα quam Latinorum *pedem* patet, et recte interpretatur Auson. Popma *de Differ. Verbor.* s. *Saltare.*

Item *cosauli*, apud Varronem *de L. L.* vii. c. 3, Græcorum χόραυλοι esse videntur, quod verbum Pollux servavit." In this word, as in *cu̓riones*, I have ventured to insert the letter u̓ (above, p. 82).

Varro, *L. L.* VII. § 27: "*Canite*, pro quo in Saliari versu scriptum est *cante*, hoc versu:

DI̓VUM ÉMPTA CANTE, DÍVUM | DÉO SÚPPLICÁNTE."

i. e. *Deorum impetu canite, deorum deum suppliciter canite.* Cf. Macrob. *Sat.* i. 9: "Saliorum carminibus *deorum deus* canitur [*Janus*]."

Festus, s. v. *Mamuri Veturi*, p. 131: "Probatum opus est maxime Mamuri Veturi, qui præmii loco petiit, ut suum nomen inter carmina Salii canerent."

Id. s. v. *Negumate*, p. 168: "*Negumate* in carmina Cn. Marci vatis significat *negate*, cum ait: *quàmvís movéntiúm* [*molimentum* Herm. *El. D. M.* p. 614] *du-ónum négumáte.*"

Id. s. v. *Obstinet*, p. 197: "*Obstinet* dicebant antiqui, quod nunc est ostendit; ut in veteribus carminibus: *sèd jám se cǽlo cédens* [*Aurora*] *óbstinét suum pátrem.*" Here it will be observed that *se cœlo cedens* = *cœlo secedens*, and that *suum* is a monosyllable (see Fest. p. 301).

Id. s. v. *Præceptat*, p. 205: "*Præceptat* in Saliari carmine est sæpe præcipit. *Pa* pro patre, et *po* pro potissimum, positum est in Saliari carmine. *Promenervat* item pro monet. *Prædopiont*, præoptant, &c. *Pilumnœ poplœ* in carmine Saliari, Romani, velut pilis assueti: vel quia præcipue pellant hostes."

Id. s. v. *Redantruare*, p. 270: "*Redantruare* dicitur in Saliorum exsultationibus, quod cum præsul amptruavit, quod est motus edidit, ei referuntur invicem idem motus. Lucilius: *Præsul ut amptruat inde; ita volgu̓ redamptruat ollim.* Pacuvius:

Promerenda gratia
Simul cum videam Graios nihil mediocriter
Redamptruare, opibusque summis persequi."

According to Varges (*Rhein. Mus.* for 1835, pp. 62, sqq.) the fragment of Lucilius ought to be read thus: *Præsul ut ampirvat, sic vulgu̓ redantruat inde.* He derives *ampirvo* from the Greek ἄμπειρα, which, according to Hesychius (s. v. ἀνάπειρα), was ῥυθμός τις αὐλητικός; for Dionysius tells us (*Antiq.* II. 70)

that the Salii danced to the flute. The same name was given to the second part of the Pythian nome (Timosthenes, *ap. Strab.* IX. 3); and Argolus (Græv. *Thesaur.* IX. p. 342) explains the passage in Claudian (VI. *Cons. Hon.* 626-30) by a reference to the Pythian nome. Turnebus (*Advers.* XVII. 8, Vol. II. p. 145) connects *am-pirvo* with the French *pirouetter;* comp. the Oscan *am-pert* = *per;* above, Ch. V. § 4.

Id. p. 290 (*ex Suppl. Ursin.*): "*Sesopia* in augurali et Saliari carmine appellantur, quæ alias esopia pro sedilibus dicere habemus nunc adhuc in consuetudine."

Id. s. v. *Sonivio*, ibid.: "*Sonivio* significat in carmine [Saliari et a]ugurali sonanti."

Id. p. 360: "*Tame* in carmine positum est pro *tam.*" So also *cume* for *cum*, Terent. *Scaur.* p. 2661 P., who quotes from the Salian songs.

§ 5. *Old Regal Laws.*

The fragments of the oldest Roman laws, though undoubtedly genuine in substance, must be considered as having undergone considerable alteration in the orthography at all events. They are precious memorials of primeval Latinity; but, like the Homeric poems, they not unfrequently exhibit the deformity of an ancient statue, which the false taste of a later age may have daubed over with a coat of coloured plaster.

One of these fragments professes to be as old as the time of Romulus and Tatius. Festus, s. v. *Plorare*, p. 230: "*Plorare, flere* nunc significat, et cum præpositione *implorare*, i. e. *invocare;* sed apud antiquos plane *inclamare.* In regis Romuli et Tatii legibus: *Si nurus . . . sacra divis parentum estod.* In Servi Tulli hæc est: *Si parentum puer verberit, ast olle plorasset, puer divis parentum sacer esto;* i. e. *inclamarit, dix*[*erit diem*]." The restoration of the laws quoted in this passage may be given thus: (1) *Sei nuros* [*parentem verbesit, ast ole plorasit*], *sacra diveis parentom estod.* (2) *Sei parentem puer verbesit, ast ole plorasit, puer diveis parentom sacer estod.*

In these fragments two forms deserve to be noticed. If *verberit*, as it is quoted in Festus, were a syncope for *verberarit*, the old form would be *verberasit.* It seems, however, that there was an older form of *verbero*, inflected according to the third conjugation, like *carint* (Plautus, *Mostell.* IV. 1, 1) and *tem-*

perint (*Trucul.* I. 1, 41). The three participles, *verbustus, castus, tempestus* (Fest. p. 362), are further indications of such original forms. Accordingly *verberit* is the modern orthography, not of *verberarit*, but of *verbesit* or *verbussit* (Müller, *Suppl. Annot. in Fest.* p. 393). We should write *ole* = *olle* with one *l*. That this was the primitive orthography is proved, not only by the express testimony of Festus (s. v. *Solitaurilia*, p. 293; id. s. v. *Torum*, p. 355; id. s. v. *ab oloes*, p. 19: "*ab oloes* dicebant pro *ab illis;* antiqui enim litteram non geminabant"), but still more strikingly by the locative *olim*, which retained its orthography long after its derivation had been forgotten.

There are several fragments of the laws of Numa Pompilius. Festus, s. v. *Occisum*, p. 178: "*Occisum* a *necato* distingui quidam, quod alterum a cædendo atque ictu fieri dicunt, alterum sine ictu. Itaque in Numæ Pompili regis legibus scriptum esse: *Si hominem fulmen Jovis occisit, ne supra genua tollitor.* Et alibi: *Homo si fulmine occisus est, ei justa nulla fieri oportet.*" In the old orthography these fragments would run thus: *Sei hemonem fulmin Jobis ocisit, nei supra cenua tolitor. Hemo sei fulmined ocisus escit, eiei jousta nula fieri oportet.* For the form *hemo*, see Müller *ad Fest.* p. 100. *Escit*, an inchoative of *est*, has a future signification: see Müller *ad Fest.* p. 77; and *Suppl. Annot.* p. 386.

Festus (s. v. *Parrici*[*di*] *Quæstores*, p. 221) quotes a short fragment from another law of Numa, which defines the word *parricida*: "*Si qui hominem liberum dolo sciens morti duit, parricidas esto;*" i. e. in the old orthography: *Sei qui hemonem lœbesum* (Fest. p. 121) *dolo sciens mortei duit, pariceidas estod.* The *Parricidi Quæstores* seem to have been the same as the *Perduellionis Duumviri.* The law respecting the punishment of the criminal and his right of appeal, which both Livy and Cicero call a *carmen*, has been thus preserved in Saturnian verse:

Duúmvirí perduélli|ónem júdicánto.
Si a duúmvirís provocásit | provocátióne certáto.
Si víncent, cáput obnúbito in|félici árbore réste
Suspéndito, vérberáto | íntra vel éxtra pómœrum.

I have here written *judicanto* for *judicent*, because the final thesis cannot be suppressed (below, § 20). The *v* or *b* is slurred over in *pro'casit, pro'catione*, and *obnu'to*, according to the common Roman pronunciation. Each trochaic tripodia in l. 2

begins with an anacrusis. According to Livy (I. 26), the law belongs to the time of Tullus Hostilius; Cicero, on the other hand (*pro Rabir.* c. 4, § 13), refers it to the legislation of Tarquinius.

Id. s. v. *Pellices*, p. 222: "Cui generi mulierum pœna constituta est a Numa Pompilio hac lege: *Pellex aram Junonis ne tangito; si tanget, Junoni crinibus demissis agnum fœminam cœdito.*" i. e. *Pelecs asam Junonis nei tancitud; sei tancet, Junonei crinebos demiseis acnom feminam ceditud.*

Id. s. v. *Opima spolia*, p. 189: "Esse etiam Pompili regis legem opimorum spoliorum talem: *Cujus auspicio classe procincta opima spolia capiuntur, Jovi Feretrio bovem cœdito; qui cepit* [ei] *æris* CCC *darier oportet:* [cujus auspicio capiuntur] *secunda spolia, in Martis aram in Campo solitaurilia utra voluerit* (*i. e.* 'vel majora vel lactentia,' Scal.) *cœdito;* [qui cepit, ei æris CC dato]: [cujus auspicio capiuntur] *tertia spolia Janui Quirino agnum marem cœdito,* C *qui ceperit ex ære dato; cujus auspicio capta, dis piaculum dato.*" Niebuhr (*H. R.* II. note 972) explains these gradations of reward by a reference to the scale of pay in the Roman army. The supplements in this passage rest principally on Plutarch, *Vit. Marc.* c. 8: καὶ λαμβάνειν γέρας, ἀσσάρια τριακόσια τὸν πρῶτον, τὸν δὲ δεύτερον διακόσια, τὸν δὲ τρίτον ἑκατόν.

Plin. *H. N.* XXXII. 2, 10, § 20: "*Pisceis quei squamosei nec sunt, nei polucetod; squamosos omneis præter scarom polucetod.*" Cf. Fest. s. v. *Pollucere*, p. 253: "*Pollucere* merces [quas cuivis deo liceat], sunt far, polenta, vinum, panis fermentalis, ficus passa, suilla, bubula, agnina, casei, ovilla, alica, sesama, et oleum, pisces quibus est squama, præter scarum: Herculi autem omnia esculenta, poculenta."

Id. s. v. *Termino*, p. 368: "Denique Numa Pompilius statuit, *Eum qui terminum exarasset et ipsum et boves sacros esse.*" i. e. *Qui terminom ecsaraset, ipsus et boveis sacrei sunto* (See Dirksen, *Versuche*, p. 334).

Id. s. v. *Aliuta*, p. 6: "*Aliuta* antiqui dicebant pro aliter, ... hinc est illud in legibus Numæ Pompili: *Siquisquam aliuta facsit ipsos Jovei sacer estod.*"

§ 6. *Remains of the XII. Tables.*

But of all the legal fragments which exhibit the *prisca vetustas verborum* (Cic. *de Oratore*, I. c. 43), the most copious, as well as the most important, are the remains of the Twelve Tables, of which Cicero speaks in such enthusiastic, if not hyperbolical language. These fragments have been more than once collected and explained. In the following extracts I have followed the text of Dirksen (*Uebersicht der bisherigen Versuche zur Kritik und Herstellung des Textes der Zwölf-Tafel-Fragmente*). The object, however, of Dirksen's elaborate work is juristic[1] rather than philological; whereas I have only wished to present these fragments as interesting specimens of old Latinity.

It was probably the intention of the decemvirs to comprise their system in six double Tables; for each successive pair of Tables seems to refer to matters which are naturally classed together. Thus Tab. I. and II. relate to the *legis actiones;* Tab. III. and IV. to the *mancipium, potestas,* and *manus,* or the rights which might be acquired over insolvent debtors, the right of a father over his son, and of a husband over his wife; Tab. V. and VI. to the laws of guardianship, inheritance and property; Tab. VII. and VIII. to *obligationes, delicta,* and *crimina;* Tab. IX. and X. to the *jus publicam* and *jus sacrum;* Tab. XI. and XII. were supplementary to the ten former Tables, both in subject and in date.

§ 7. *Tab. I.*

Fr. 1. (I. 1, 2, Gothofredi): SI . IN . JUS . VOCAT . NI . IT . ANTESTATOR . IGITUR . EM . CAPITO . (Porphyrio *ad Hor.* I. *Serm.* 9, 65: "Adversarius molesti illius Horatium consulit, an permittat se antestari, injecta manu extracturus ad Prætorem, quod vadimonio non paruerit. De hac autem *Lege* XII. *Tabularum* his verbis cautum est: *si vis vocationi testamini, igitur en capito antestari.* Est ergo antestari, scilicet antequam manum injiciat." Cf. Cic. *Legg.* II. c. 4; Aul. Gell. *N. A.* XX. 1; *Auctor ad Herenn.* II. c. 13; Non. Marcell. *de Propr. Serm.* c. 1, § 20, s. v. *calvitur.* Lucilius, *Lib.* XVII.: "Si non it, *capito,* inquit, *eum et, si calvitur ergo, Ferto manum*"). It seems probable

[1] The student will find a general sketch of the old Roman law in Arnold's *Rome,* I. pp. 256, sqq.

that the original form of the law was, *si quis in jus vocatus nec it, antestamino, igitur* (i. e. *inde, postea, tum,* Fest. p. 105) *em* (=*eum*) *capito.* Cf. Gronov. *Lect. Plautin.* p. 95.

Fr. 2 (I. 3): SI . CALVITUR . PEDEMVE . STRUIT, . MANUM . ENDO . JACITO . (Festus, p. 313). The word *calvitur* is explained by Gaius, *L.* 233, *pr. D. de Verb. Sign.:* "*Si calvitur* et moretur et frustretur. Inde et *calumniatores* appellati sunt, quia per fraudem et frustrationem alios vexarent litibus." *Pedem struere* is explained by Festus, l. l.: "Alii putant significare *retrorsum ire:* alii, *in aliam partem:* alii *fugere:* alii *gradum augere:* alii *minuere,* cum quis vix pedem pedi præfert, otiose it, remoratur:" and p. 210: "*pedem struit* in XII. significat *fugit,* ut ait Ser. Sulpicius." This fragment seems to have followed close upon the previous one: see the passage of Lucilius, quoted above.

Fr. 3 (I. 4): SI . MORBUS . AEVITASVE . VITIUM . ESCIT, . QUI . IN . JUS . VOCABIT . JUMENTUM . DATO; . SI . NOLET . ARCERAM . NE . STERNITO . (Aul. Gell. *N. A.* XX. 1). *Vitium escit* means *impedimento erit. Arcera* is explained by Nonius Marcellus, *de Propr. Serm.* I. § 270: "*Arcera* plaustrum est rusticum, tectum undique quasi *arca.* Hoc vocabulum et apud Varronem et apud M. Tullium invenitur. Hoc autem vehiculi genere *senes et ægroti* vectari solent. Varro γεροντιδιδασκάλῳ: *vehebatur cum uxore vehiculo semel aut bis anno cum arcera: si non vellet non sterneret.*"

Fr. 4 (I. 6): ASSIDUO . VINDEX . ASSIDUUS . ESTO, . PROLETARIO . QUOI . QUIS . VOLET . VINDEX . ESTO . (Aul. Gell. *N. A.* XVI. c. 10; cf. Cicero, *Top.* c. 2, who explains *assiduus* as a synonym of *locuples,* and derives it, with Ælius, *ab asse dando;* Nonius, *Propr. Serm.* c. 1, § antepen., who explains *proletarius* as equivalent to *plebeius*—"qui tantum *prolem* sufficiat." See Niebuhr, *Hist. Rom.* I. p. 445, note 1041).

Fr. 5 (IX. 2). Festus, p. 348: "*Sanates* dicti sunt, qui supra infraque Romam habitaverunt. Quod nomen his fuit, quia cum defecissent a Romanis, brevi post redierunt in amicitiam, quasi *sanata* mente. Itaque in XII. cautum est, ut 'idem juris esset *Sanatibus* quod *Forctibus,*' id est *bonis* (cf. pp. 84, 102), et qui nunquam defecerant a P. R." Whence we may supply, p. 321: "[Hinc] in XII.: 'NEX[i solutique, ac] FORCTI SANATI[sque idem jus estod'], id est, bonor[um et qui defecerant sociorum]."

Where also *sanas* is explained from Cincius, "[quod Priscus] præter opinio[nem eos debellavis]set, sanavisse[tque ac cum iis pa]cisci potuisset." Dirksen (p. 164) is wrong in referring these extracts to the epitome of Paulus.

Fr. 6 (I. 17): REM . UBI . PAGUNT, . ORATO . (*Auctor ad Herenn.* II. c. 13).

Fr. 7 (I. 8): NI . PAGUNT . IN . COMITIO . AUT . IN . FORO . ANTE . MERIDIEM . CAUSAM . CONJICITO, . QUOM . PERORANT . AMBO . PRAESENTES . (id. ibid. and Aul. Gell. XVII. 2). The word *pagunt* is explained by Priscian (X. 5, § 32) as a synonym of *paciscor;* the common Latin form is *pa-n-go*, but the medial and tenuis of the gutturals were constantly interchanged after the distinction between them was introduced by Sp. Carvilius (Terent. Scaur. p. 2253, Putsch).

Fr. 8 (I. 9): POST . MERIDIEM . PRAESENTI . STLITEM . ADDICITO . (Aul. Gell. XVII. 2).

Fr. 9 (I. 10): SOL . OCCASUS . SUPREMA . TEMPESTAS . ESTO . (id. ibid). The word *tempestas* is here used for *tempus;* the whole afternoon was called *tempus occiduum*, and the sunset was *suprema tempestas* (Macrob. *Saturn.* I. c. 3). Gellius, to whom we owe these fragments, considers the correct reading to be *sol*, not *solis occasus.* "*Sole occaso,*" he says, "non insuavi *venustate* (vetustate;) est, si quis aurem habeat non sordidam nec proculcatam." But Festus (p. 305), Varro (*L. L.* V. c. 2), and others, consider the phrase to have been *solis occasus.* There is more probability in the reading of Gellius.

Fr. 10 (II. 1). Aul. Gell. *N. A.* XVI. c. 10: "Sed enim quum *proletarii*, et *assidui*, et *sanates*, et *vades*, et *subvades*,—evanuerint, omnisque illa XII. Tabularum antiquitas—consopita sit," &c.

§ 8. *Tab. II.*

Fr. 1. Gaius, *Inst.* IV. § 14: "Pœna autem sacramenti aut quingenaria erat, aut quinquagenaria; nam de rebus mille æris plurisve quingentis assibus, de minoris vero quinquaginta assibus sacramento contendebatur; nam ita lege XII. Tabularum cautum erat. Sed si de libertate hominis controversia erat, etsi pretiosissimus homo esset, tamen ut L. assibus sacramento contenderetur eadem lege cautum est favoris causa ne satisdatione onerarentur adsertores."

Fr. 2 (II. 2): (*a*) MORBUS . SONTICUS—(*b*) STATUS . DIES . CUM . HOSTE—(*c*) SI . QUID . HORUM . FUAT . UNUM, . JUDICI, . ARBITROVE . REOVE, . DIES . DIFFENSUS . ESTO . (*a*) Aul. Gell. XX. c. 1: "Morbum vehementiorem, vim graviter nocendi habentem, Leg. istar. i. e. XII. Tab. scriptores alio in loco non per se *morbum*, sed *morbum sonticum* appellant." Fest. p. 290: "*Sonticum morbum* in XII. significare ait Ælius Stilo certum cum justa causa, quem non nulli putant esse, qui noceat, quod *sontes* significat *nocentes*. Nævius ait: *sonticam esse oportet causam, quam ob rem perdas mulierem.*" (*b*) Cic. *de Off.* I. c. 12: "*Hostis* enim majores nostros is dicebatur, quem nunc *peregrinum* dicimus. Indicant XII. Tabulæ ut: *status dies cum hoste;* itemque: *adversus hostem æterna auctoritas.*" Fest. p. 314: "Status dies [cum hoste] vocatur qui judici causa est constitutus cum peregrino. Ejus enim generis ab antiquis hostes appellabantur, quod erant pari jure cum populo R., atque *hostire* ponebatur pro *æquare*. Plautus in Curculione [I. 1, 5]: *si status condictus cum hoste intercedit dies, tamen est eundum, quo imperant ingratis.*" This passage is neglected by Dirksen, but not by Gronovius, *Lectiones Plautinæ*, p. 81. With regard to the original signification of *hostis*, it is very worthy of remark that the Latin *hostis* and the Greek ξένος, starting from opposite points, have interchanged their significations. *Hos-tis* originally signified "a person entertained by another," "one who has food given to him" (comp. *hos-pi-*[*t-*]*s*, "the master of the feast," *hostia, gasts*, &c. *N. Crat.* § 474); but at last it came to mean "a stranger," "a foreigner," and even "an enemy" (see Varro, *L. L.* p. 2, Müller). Whereas ξένος, originally denoting "a stranger" (*extraneus*), i. e. "one without" ([ἐ]ξένος), came in the end to signify "an entertainer" and "a friend." I cannot accept Müller's derivation of ξένος (*ad Fest.* p. 102). (*c*) Festus, p. 273: "*Reus* nunc dicitur, qui causam dicit; et item qui quid promisit spoponditve, ac debet. At Gallus Ælius libro II. *Sign. Verb. qu. ad Jus pertinent*, ait: *Reus est, qui cum altero litem contestatam habet, sive is egit, sive cum eo actum est. Reus stipulando est idem qui stipulator dicitur, quive suo nomine ab altero quid stipulatus est, non is qui alteri adstipulatus est. Reus promittendo est qui suo nomine alteri quid promisit, non qui pro altero quid promisit.* At Capito Ateius in eadem quidem opinione est: sed exemplo adjuvat interpreta-

tionem. Nam in secunda Tabula secunda lege in qua scriptum est: *si quid horum fuat unum judici arbitrove reove, eo die diffensus esto,* hic uterque, actor reusque, in judicio rei vocantur, itemque accusator de via citur more vetere et consuetudine antiqua." Ulpian. L. LXXIV. *ad Edict.:* "Si quis judicio se sisti promiserit, et valetudine vel tempestate vel vi fluminis prohibitus se sistere non possit, exceptione adjuvatur; nec immerito: cum enim in tali permissione præsentia opus sit, quemadmodum potuit se sistere qui adversa valetudine impeditus est? Et ideo etiam Lex XII. Tab.: *si judex vel alteruter ex litigatoribus morbo sontico impediatur, jubet diem judicii esse diffensum.*" I have restored *diffensus* both in Festus and Ulpian on the authority of Müller, who has shown (*Suppl. Annot. ad Fest.* p. 401) that *fendo* must have been anciently a synonym of *ferio* and *trudo,* and consequently that *diffensus esto* = *differatur.*

Fr. 3 (II. 3): CUI . TESTIMONIUM . DEFUERIT, . IS . TERTIIS . DIEBUS . OB . PORTUM . OBVAGULATUM . ITO . (Fest. p. 233: "*Portum* in XII. pro *domo* positum omnes fere consentiunt: si," &c. Id. p. 375: "*Vagulatio* in lege XII. [Tab.] significat *quæstionem cum convicio: si,*" &c.).

Fr. 4 (II. 12). "Nam et de furto pacisci lex permittit" (L. 7. § 14. D. *de Pactis,* Ulp. IV. *ad Edictum*).

§ 9. *Tab. III.*

Fr. 1 (III. 4): AERIS . CONFESSI . REBUSQUE . JURE . JUDICATIS . TRIGINTA . DIES . JUSTI . SUNTO . (Aul. Gell. XX. c. 1: "Eosque dies Decemviri justos appellaverunt, velut quoddam justitium, id est juris inter eos quasi interstitionem quandam et cessationem, quibus diebus nihil cum his agi jure posset." XV. c. 13; cf. Gaius, *Inst.* III. § 78, &c.).

Fr. 2 (III. 5): POST . DEINDE . MANUS . INJECTIO . ESTO; . IN . JUS . DUCITO . (Aul. Gell. XX. c. 1; cf. Gaius, *Inst.* IV. § 21).

Fr. 3 (III. 6): NI . JUDICATUM . FACIT (l. *faxsit*), . AUT . QUIPS . ENDO . EM . JURE . VINDICIT, . SECUM . DUCITO; . VINCITO, . AUT . NERVO . AUT . COMPEDIBUS, . QUINDECIM . PONDO . NE . MAJORE, . AUT . SI . VOLET . MINORE . VINCITO . (Aul. Gell. XX. c. 1). We should perhaps read *faxsit* for *facit* on account of *vindicit,* for which see Müller, *Suppl. Ann. ad Fest.* p. 393. For the form *quips* see Gronovius *ad Gell. l.;* the proper read-

ing is *ques;* see below, § 23. For the meaning of *nervus* here, comp. Fest. s. v. p. 765.

Fr. 4 (III. 7): SI . VOLET, . SUO . VIVITO; . NI . SUO . VIVIT, . QUI . EM . VINCTUM . HABEBIT, . LIBRAS . FARRIS . ENDO . DIES . DATO; . SI . VOLET . PLUS . DATO . (Aul. Gell. XX. c. 1; and for the meaning of *vivere* compare L. 234, § 2. D. *de Verb. Sign.;* Gaius, L. II. *ad Leg.* XII. *Tab.;* Donat. *ad Terent. Phorm.* II. 1, 20). The student will observe that *endo dies = indies.*

Fr. 5 (III. 8). Aul. Gell. *N. A.* XX. 1: "Erat autem jus interea paciscendi; ac nisi pacti forent, habebantur in vinculis, dies LX.; inter eos dies trinis nundinis continuis ad Prætorem in comitium producebantur, quantæque pecuniæ judicati essent prædicabatur." From which Ursinus conjectures: *Endoderatim* [rather *interatim.* Festus, p. 111] *pacio estod. Nei cum eo pacit,* LX. *dies vinctom habetod. In ieis diebus tertieis nondineis continueis indu comitium endo joure im procitato, quanteique stlis æstumata siet prædicato.*

Fr. 6 (III. 9). Aul. Gell. XX. 1: "Tertiis autem nundinis capite pœnas dabant, aut trans Tiberim peregre venum ibant—si plures forent, quibus reus esset judicatus, secare si vellent atque partiri corpus addicti sibi hominis permiserunt—verba ipsa Legis dicam:—TERTIIS, inquit, NUNDINIS PARTIS SECANTO, SI PLUS MINUSVE SECUERUNT, SE FRAUDE ESTO." Cf. Quinctil. *Inst. Or.* III. c. 6; Tertullian. *Apol.* c. 4. The student will remark that we have here *se* for *sine,* as in the compounds *se-dulo* (= *sine dolo*), *se-paro, se-cludo, se-motus, se-gregatus,* &c. (See Festus, p. 336). *Se = sed* is an ablative form which in later Latin appears only in composition; *sine* accords in form with the Sanscrit instrumental, and was used as a preposition to the latest period of the language. Accordingly these two forms may be compared with the Greek κα and κατά; the former being used only as the particle of *apodosis* or in composition (as κάπετον Pind. *O.* VIII. 38), while the latter retains to the end its regular prepositional functions.

Fr. 7 (III. 3): ADVERSUS . HOSTEM . AETERNA . AUCTORITAS . (Cic. *de Off.* I. c. 12).

§ 10. *Tab. IV.*

Fr. 1 (IV. 1). Cic. *de Legg.* III. c. 8: "Deinde quum [Trib. pot. ortus] esset cito legatus [*leto datus,* Orelli], *tam-*

quam ex XII. *Tabulis insignis ad deformitatem puer.*" From whence we infer that the XII. Tables authorised the exposure of deformed children.

Fr. 2 (IV. 2). From the statement of Dionysius (II. 26, 27), that the decemvirs in their fourth Table continued the *jus vendendorum liberorum* established in the time of the kings, Ursinus imagines some such passage as this: PATREI . ENDO . FIDIO . VITAE . NECISQUE . POTESTAS . ESTOD, . TERQUE . IN . VENOM . DARIER . JOUS . ESTOD; to which he appends the next fragment.

Fr. 3 (IV. 3): SI . PATER . FILIUM . TER . VENUM . DUIT, . FILIUS . A . PATRE . LIBER . ESTO. (Ulpian, *Fr. Tit.* X. § 1; Gaius, *Inst.* I. § 132; IV. § 79).

Fr. 4 (IV. 4). Aul. Gell. III. 16: ..." Quoniam Decemviri in decem mensibus gigni hominem, non in undecimo scripsissent;" whence Gothofredus would restore: *si qui ei in* X. *mensibus proximis postumus natus escit, justus esto.*

§ 11. *Tab. V.*

Fr. 1. Gaius, *Inst.* I. § 145: "Loquimur autem exceptis Virginibus Vestalibus, quas etiam veteres in honorem sacerdotii liberas esse voluerunt; itaque etiam lege XII. Tabularum cautum est." Cf. Plutarch, *Vit. Num.* c. 10.

Fr. 2. Id. II. § 47: "(Item olim) mulieris quæ in agnatorum tutela erat, res mancipi usucapi non poterant, præterquam si ab ipso tutore (*auctore*) traditæ essent: id ita lege XII. Tabularum cautum erat."

Fr. 3 (V. 1): [PATERFAMILIAS] . UTI . LEGASSIT . SUPER . PECUNIA . TUTELAVE . SUAE . REI, . ITA . JUS . ESTO . (Ulpian, *Fr. Tit.* XI. § 14; Gaius, *Inst.* II. § 224; Cic. *de Invent. Rhet.* II. c. 50; Novell. *Justin.* XXII. c. 2, &c.).

Fr. 4 (V. 2): SI . INTESTATO . MORITUR . CUI . SUUS . HERES . NEC . SIT, . ADGNATUS . PROXIMUS . FAMILIAM . HABETO. (Ulpian, *Fr. Tit.* XXVI. § 1; cf. Gaius, *Inst.* III. § 9, &c.).

Fr. 5 (V. 3): SI . ADGNATUS . NEC . ESCIT, . GENTILIS . FAMILIAM . NANXITOR. (*Collatio Legg. Mosaic. et Rom. Tit.* XVI. § 4; cf. Gaius, *Inst.* III. § 17). I have written *nanxitor* for *nancitor* on the authority of Müller, *ad Fest.* p. 166: "*nanxitor* in XII., nactus erit, præhenderit;" where he remarks: "*nancitor* quomodo futurum exactum esse possit, non intelligo, nisi correcta

una littera. Ab antiquo verbo *nancio* fut. ex. fit *nanxo*, sicut a *capio capso;* idque translatum in pass. form. efficit *nanxitur* vel *nanxitor*, ut a *turbasso* fit *turbassitur.*"

Fr. 6 (V. 7). Gaius, *Inst.* I. § 155: "Quibus testamento quidem tutor datus non sit, iis ex lege XII. agnati sunt tutores; qui vocantur legitimi." Cf. § 157, where he says that this applied to women also.

Fr. 7 (V. 8): SI . FURIOSUS . AUT . PRODIGUS . ESCIT, . AST . EI . CUSTOS . NEC . ESCIT, . ADGNATORUM . GENTILIUMQUE . IN . EO . PEQVUNIAQUE . EJUS . POTESTAS . ESTO. (Cicer. *de Invent. Rhet.* II. c. 50, gives the bulk of this passage; *aut prodigus* is inserted on the authority of Ulpian, § 3, i. *de Curationibus;* and *ast ei custos nec escit* is derived from Festus, p. 162: "*Nec* conjunctionem grammatici fere dicunt esse disjunctivam, ut *nec legit nec scribit*, cum si diligentius inspiciatur, ut fecit Sinnius Capito, intelligi possit eam positam esse ab antiquis pro *non*, ut et in XII. est: *ast ei custos nec escit*"). For *nec* see above, Ch. III. § 9, and below, Ch. VII. § 5.

Fr. 8 (V. 4). Ulpian, *Frag. Tit.* XXIX. § 1; *L.* 195, § 1. D. *de Verb. Sign.:* "Civis Romani liberti hereditatem lex XII. Tab. patrono defert, si intestato sine suo herede libertus decesserit—Lex: EX EA FAMILIA, inquit, IN EAM FAMILIAM." Gothofredus proposes the following restoration of the law: *si libertus intestato moritur cui suus heres nec escit, ast patronus patronive liberi escint, ex ea familia in eam familiam proximo pecunia adduitor.*

Fr. 9 (V. 5) and 10 (V. 6). From the numerous passages which refer the law *de ercti-ciscunda* (as the word must have been originally written) *familia* to the XII. Tables (see Hugo, *Gesch. d. Röm. R.* I. p. 229), we may perhaps suppose the law to have been: *si heredes partem quisque suam habere malint, familiæ ercti-ciscundæ tris arbitros sumunto.*

§ 12. *Tab. VI.*

Fr. 1 (VI. 1): CUM . NEXUM . FACIET . MANCIPIUMQUE, . UTI . LINGUA . NUNCUPASSIT, . ITA . JUS . ESTO. (Festus, p. 173; Cic. *de Off.* III. 16, *de Orator.* i. 57). *Nuncupare = nominare:* Festus, l. l.; Varro, *L. L.* VI. § 60, p. 95, Müller.

Fr. 2 (VI. 2). Cic. *de Offic.* III. 16: "Nam cum ex XII. Tabulis satis esset *ea præstari quæ essent lingua nuncupata,*

quæ qui infitiatus esset dupli pœnam subiret; a jureconsultis etiam reticentiæ pœna est constituta."

Fr. 3 (VI. 5). Cic. *Topic.* c. 4: "Quod in re pari valet, valeat in hac, quæ par est; ut: *Quoniam usus auctoritas fundi biennium est, sit etiam ædium:* at in lege ædes non appellantur, et sunt *ceterarum rerum omnium, quarum annuus est usus.*" Cf. Cic. *pro Cæcina,* c. 19; Gaius, *Instit.* II. § 42; and Boethius *ad Top.* l. c. p. 509, Orelli.

Fr. 4 (VI. 6). Gaius, *Inst.* I. § 111: "Usu in manum conveniebat, quæ anno continuo nupta perseverabat:—itaque lege XII. Tab. cautum [erat], *si qua nollet eo modo in manum mariti conve*[nire, ut quotan]*nis trinoctio abesset, atque* [ita usum] *cujusque anni interrumperet.*" Cf. Aul. Gell. III. 2; Macrob. *Saturn.* I. 3.

Fr. 5 (VI. 7): SI . QUI . IN . JURE . MANUM . CONSERUNT . (Aul. Gell. XX. c. 10).

Fr. 6 (VI. 8). From Liv. III. 44, Dionys. Hal. XI. c. 30, &c., we may infer a law: *prætor secundum libertatem vindicias dato.*

Fr. 7 (VI. 9): TIGNUM . JUNCTUM . AEDIBUS . VINEAEVE, . E . CONCAPITE . NE . SOLVITO . (Fest. p. 364). A great number of emendations of this passage have been proposed. The reading which I have adopted is the same as Müller's, except that I prefer *concapite* to his *concape:* compare *procapis = progenies,* "quæ ab uno capite procedit" (Fest. p. 225). In the same way as we have *capes, capitis* m. = *miles; caput, capitis* n. = *vertex;* so we have *concapis, concapitis* f. = *continua capitum junctura* (comp. Madvig, *Beilage zu seiner Latein. Sprachl.* p. 33).

Fr. 8 (VI. 10). L. 1. *pr. D. de tigno juncto,* Ulpian, L. XXXVII. *ad Edictum*: "Quod providenter lex [XII. Tab.] effecit, ne vel ædificia sub hoc prætextu diruantur, vel vinearum cultura turbetur; sed in eum qui convictus est junxisse, in duplum dat actionem." Where *tignum* is defined as signifying in the XII. Tables: *omnis materia ex qua ædificium constet, vineæque necessaria.*

Fr. 9 (VI. 11): QUANDOQUE . SARPTA, . DONEC . DEMPTA . ERUNT . (Fest. p. 384). The word *sarpta* (which Müller understands of the *ipsa sarpta,* i. e. *sarmenta putata*) is explained by Festus, l. l.: "*sarpiuntur* vineæ, i. e. putantur," &c. p. 322:

"[sarpta vinea putata, i.] e. pura [facta —] inde etiam [sarmenta script]ores dici pu[tant; sarpere enim a]ntiqui pro pur[gare dicebant]." The sentence in the fragment probably ended with *vindicare jus esto.*

§ 13. *Tab. VII.*

Fr. 1 (VIII. 1). Varro, *L. L.* V. § 22, p. 9: "*Ambitus* est quod circumeundo teritur, nam *ambitus* circumitus, ab eoque XII. Tabularum interpretes *ambitum* parietis circumitum esse describunt." Volusius Mæcianus, apud Gronov. *de Sestertio*, p. 398: "*Sestertius* duos asses et semissem. Lex etiam XII. Tabularum argumento est, in qua duo pedes et semis *sestertius pes* vocatur." Festus, p. 16 (cf. p. 5): "*Ambitus* proprie dicitur inter vicinorum ædificia locus duorum pedum et semipedis ad circumeundi facultatem relictus." The law itself, therefore, probably ran thus: *inter vicinorum ædificia ambitus parietum sestertius pes esto.*

Fr. 2 (VIII. 3). Gaius (lib. IV. *ad Leg.* XII. *Tab. L. fin. D. finium regundorum*) refers to a law of Solon, which he quotes in Greek, and describes as in some measure the type of the corresponding law of the XII. Tables, which regulates digging, fencing, and building near the borders of a piece of ground.

Fr. 3 (VIII. 6): HORTUS — HEREDIUM — TUGURIUM. (Plin. *H. N.* XIX. 4, § 1: "In XII. Tab. leg. nostrar. nusquam nominatur *villa;* semper in significatione ea *hortus*, in *horti* vero *heredium.*" Festus, p. 355: "[*Tugu-*]*ria* a tecto appellantur [domicilia rusticorum] sordida — quo nomine [Messalla in explana]tione XII. ait etiam . . . . significari"). Properly speaking, the *vicus* (signifying "several houses joined together") included the *villa* (= *vicula*, Döderl. *Syn. u. Et.* III. 5), which was the residence of the proprietor, and the adjoining *tuguria*, in which the *coloni partiarii* lived. All persons living in the same *vicus* were called *vicini;* and the first fragment in this table refers to the *ambitus* between the houses of those who lived on the same estate. The pasture-land left common to the *vicini* was called *compascuus ager* (Festus, p. 40). It is not improbable that the words *compescere* and *impescere* occurred in the XII. Tables. See, however, Dirksen, p. 534. *Ager* is defined as: "locus qui sine villa est" (Ulpian, L. 27. *Pr. D. de V. S.*). But in a remarkable passage in Festus (p. 371), the *vicus* is similarly described in its opposition to the *villa* or *prædium.* The passage is as

follows (see Müller, *Suppl. Ann.* p. 413): "Vici appellari incipiunt ab agris, [et sunt eorum hominum,] qui ibi villas non habent, ut Marsi aut Peligni, sed ex vicis partim habent rempublicam, [ubi] et jus dicitur, partim nihil eorum, et tamen ibi nundinæ aguntur negotii gerendi causa, et magistri vici, item magistri pagi, [in iis] quotannis fiunt. Altero, cum id genus officiorum [significatur], quæ continentia sunt in oppidis, quæve itineribus regionibusve distributa inter se distant, nominibusque dissimilibus discriminis causa sunt dispartita. Tertio, cum id genus ædificiorum definitur, quæ in oppido prive, id est in suo quisque loco proprio ita ædificat, ut in eo ædificio pervium sit, quo itinere habitatores ad suam quisque habitationem habeat accessum: qui non dicuntur vicani, sicut ii, qui aut in oppidi vicis, aut ii, qui in agris sunt, vicani appellantur." Festus here describes (1) the *vicus rusticus*, (2) a street in a town, as the *vicus Cyprius*, and (3) a particular kind of insulated house (*insula*) in the city.

Fr. 4 and 5 (VIII. 4, 5). Cicero *de Legg.* I. c. 21: "Usucapionem XII. Tabulæ intra quinque pedes esse noluerunt." Non. Marcell. *de Propr. Serm.* c. 5, § 34, quotes, as the words of the law: SI JURGANT. "*Si jurgant*, inquit. Benevolorum concertatio non *lis*, ut inimicorum, sed *jurgium* dicitur." Ursinus supposes the law to have been: *si vicini inter se jurgassint, intra* V. *pedes usucapio ne esto.*

Fr. 6 (VIII. 10). L. 8. D. *de Servit. Præd. Rustic.*: "Viæ latitudo ex lege XII. Tab. in porrectum octo pedes habet; in anfractum, id est, ubi flexum est, sedecim." Varro, *L. L.* VII. § 15, p. 124: "*Anfractum* est flexum, ab origine duplici dictum, ab ambitu et frangendo; ab eo leges jubent, in directo pedum VIII. esse, in anfracto XVI., id est in flexu."

Fr. 7 (VIII. 11). Cicero *pro Cæcina*, c. 19: "Si via sit immunita, jubet (lex), qua velit agere jumentum." Cf. Festus, p. 21, s. v. *Amsegetes.* Müller and Huschke express their surprise that Dirksen and other learned jurists should have overlooked the passage in Festus, which contains the best materials for the restoration of this law. Festus (s. v. *Viæ*, p. 371) says: "Viæ sunt et publicæ, per [quas ire, agere, veher]e omnibus licet: privatæ quibus [vehiculum immittere non licet] præter eorum, quorum sunt privatæ. [In XII. est: AMSEGETES] VIAS MUNIUNTO, DONICUM LAPIDES ESCUNT: [NI MUNIERINT,] QUA VOLET JUMENTA AGITO." See Müller, *Suppl. Annot.* p. 414.

Fr. 8 (VIII. 9). L. 5. D. *ne quid in l. publ.* Paulus, Lib. XVI. *ad Sabinum:* "Si per publicum locum rivus aquæductus privato nocebit, erit actio privato ex lege XII. Tab. ut noxæ domino caveatur." L. 21. D. *de Statuliber.* Pompon. L. VII. *ex Plautio:* SI . AQUA . PLUVIA . NOCET.

Fr. 9 (VIII. 7). L. 1, § 8. D. *de Arboribus cædend.* Ulp. L. LXXI. *ad Edict.:* "Lex XII. Tab. efficere voluit, ut XV. pedes altius rami arboris circumcidantur." From which, and Festus, p. 348, it is proposed to restore the law: *si arbor in vicini agrum impendet, altius a terra pedes* XV. *sublucator.*

Fr. 10 (VIII. 8). Plin. *H. N.* XVI. c. 5: "Cautum est præterea lege XII. Tab., ut glandem in alienum fundum procidentem liceret colligere." The English law makes a similar provision respecting rabbit-burrows.

Fr. 11 (VI. 4). § 1, 41, I. *de Rer. Divis.:* "Venditæ vero res et traditæ non aliter emptori adquiruntur, quam si is venditori pretium solverit, vel alio modo satisfecerit, veluti expromissore, aut pignore dato. Quod cavetur quidem et lege XII. Tab., tamen recte dicitur et jure gentium, i. e. jure naturali, effici."

Fr. 12 (VI. 3). Ulpian, *Fr.* tit. 2, § 4: "Sub hac conditione liber esse jussus, si decem millia heredi dederit, etsi ab herede abalienatus sit, emptori dando pecuniam, ad libertatem perveniet: idque lex XII. Tab. jubet." Cf. Fest. s. v. *Statuliber,* p. 314.

§ 14. *Tab. VIII.*

Fr. 1 (VIII. 8). Cic. *de Republ.* IV. 10: "Nostræ XII. Tabulæ, quum perpaucas res capite sanxissent, in his hanc quoque sanciendam putaverunt: *si quis occentavisset, sive carmen condidisset, quod infamiam faceret flagitiumve alteri.*" Festus, p. 181: "*Occentassint* antiqui dicebant quod nunc *convitium fecerint* dicimus, quod id clare, et cum quodam canore fit, ut procul exaudiri possit. Quod turpe habetur, quia non sine causa fieri putatur. Inde cantilenam dici querellam, non cantus jucunditatem puto." Plautus, *Curcul.* I. 2, 57; Horat. II. *Serm.* 1, 80; II. *Epist.* 1, 152. Gothofredus would restore the law thus: *si quis pipulo* (= *ploratu,* Fest. p. 253; cf. p. 212, s. v. *pipatio*) *occentassit, carmenve condidisset,* &c. *fuste ferito.*

Fr. 2 (VII. 9): SI MEMBRUM . RUPIT . NI . CUM . EO . PACIT, . TALIO . ESTO . (Fest. p. 363: "Permittit lex parem vindictam." Aul. Gell. XX. 1; Gaius, *Inst.* III. § 223).

Fr. 3 (VII. 10). Gaius, *Inst.* III. § 223: "Propter os vero fractum aut conlisum CCC. assium pœna erat (ex lege XII. Tab.), velut si libero os fractum erat; at si servo, CL." Cf. Aul. Gell. XX. 1.

Fr. 4 (VII. 7): SI . INJURIAM . FAXIT . ALTERI, . VIGINTI . QUINQUE . AERIS . POENAE . SUNTO . (Aul. Gell. XX. 1; cf. Gaius, *Inst.* III. § 223). Fest. p. 371: "*Viginti quinque pœnas* in XII. significat viginti quinque asses." Here *pœnas* = *poinas* is the old form of the genitive singular and nominative plural.

Fr. 5 (VII. 2): RUPITIAS . [QUI . FAXIT] . SARCITO . (Fest. s. vv. pp. 265, 322) i. e. *qui damnum dederit præstato.*

Fr. 6 (VII. 5). L. 1, pr. D. *si Quadrup. Paup. fec. dic.* Ulp. XVIII. *ad Edict.:* "Si quadrupes pauperiem fecisse dicetur, actio ex lege XII. Tab. descendit; quæ lex voluit aut dari id quod nocuit, id est, id animal, quod noxiam commisit, aut æstimationem noxiæ offerre."

Fr. 7 (VII. 5). L. 14, § 3. D. *de Præscr. Verb.:* "Si glans ex arbore tua in meum fundum cadat, eamque ego immisso pecore depascam, Aristo scribit non sibi occurrere legitimam actionem, qua experiri possim, nam neque ex lege XII. Tab. de pastu pecoris, quia non in tuo pascitur, neque de pauperie neque de damni injuriæ agi posse" (cf. Tab. VII. Fr. 10).

Fr. 8 (VII. 3): QUI . FRUGES . EXCANTASSIT . (Plin. *H. N.* XXVIII. c. 2). NEVE . ALIENAM . SEGETEM . PELLEXERIS . (Serv. *ad Virg. Ecl.* VIII. 99). Cf. Seneca, *Nat. Quæst.* IV. 7, &c.

Fr. 9 (VII. 4). Plin. *H. N.* XVIII. c. 3: "Frugem quidem aratro quæsitam furtim noctu pavisse ac secuisse, puberi XII. Tabulis capitale erat, suspensumque Cereri necari jubebant; gravius quam in homicidio convictum: impubem prætoris arbitratu verberari, noxiamque duplione decerni."

Fr. 10 (VII. 6). L. 9. D. *de Incend. Ruina Naufr.* Gaius, IV. *ad* XII. *Tab.:* "Qui *ædes acervumve frumenti* juxta domum positum *combusserit, vinctus verberatus igni necari* jubetur, si modo sciens prudensque id commiserit: si vero *casu*, id est, negligentia, aut *noxiam sarcire* jubetur, aut si minus *idoneus* sit, levius castigatur: appellatione autem *ædium* omnes species ædificii continentur."

Fr. 11 (II. 11). Plin. *H. N.* XVII. 1: "Fuit et arborum cura legibus priscis; cautumque est XII. Tabulis, ut qui injuria cecidisset alienas, lueret in singulas æris XXV."

Fr. 12 (II. 4): SI . NOX . FURTUM . FACTUM . SIT, . SI . IM . OCCISIT, . JURE . CAESUS . ESTO . (Macrob. *Saturn.* I. c. 4). Here *nox* = *noctu;* Aul. Gell. VIII. c. 1.

Fr. 13 (II. 8). L. 54, § 2. D. *de furt.* Gaius, Lib. XIII. *ad Edict. Provinc.:* "Furem interdiu deprehensum non aliter occidere lex XII. Tab. permisit, quam si telo se defendat."

Fr. 14 (II. 5—7). Aul. Gell. XI. c. 18: "Ex ceteris autem manifestis furibus liberos verberari addicique jusserunt (decemviri) ei, cui factum furtum esset, si modo id luci fecissent, neque se telo defendissent: servos item furti manifesti prensos verberibus affici et e saxo præcipitari; sed pueros impuberes prætoris arbitratu verberari voluerunt, noxamque ab his factam sarciri." Cf. Gaius, III. § 189. For the last part, cf. Fr. 9.

Fr. 15 (II. 9). Gaius, *Inst.* III. § 191, 192: "Concepti et oblati (furti) pœna ex lege XII. Tab. tripli est,—præcipit (lex) ut qui quærere velit, nudus quærat linteo cinctus, lancem habens; qui si quid invenerit, jubet id lex furtum manifestum esse." Cf. Aul. Gell. XI. 18, XVI. 10.

Fr. 16 (II. 10): SI . ADORAT . FURTO . QUOD . NEC . MANIFESTUM . ESCIT . (Fest. p. 162. Gaius, *Inst.* III. § 190: "Nec manifesti furti per leg. XII. Tab. dupli irrogatur"). For the use of *adoro*, see Fest. p. 19: "*Adorare* apud antiquos significabat *agere*, unde et legati *oratores* dicuntur, quia mandata populi *agunt:*" add, Fest. s. v. *oratores*, p. 182; Varro, *L. L.* VI. § 76, VII. § 41, &c.

Fr. 17 (II. 13). Gaius, *Inst.* II. § 45: "Furtivam (rem) lex XII. Tab. usucapi prohibet."

Fr. 18 (III. 2). Cato, *R. R. procem.:* "Majores nostri sic habuerunt, itaque in legibus posuerunt, furem dupli damnari, fœneratorem quadrupli." Tacit. *Annal.* VI. 16: "Nam primo XII. Tabulis sanctum, ne quis unciario fœnere amplius exerceret." See Niebuhr, *H. R.* III. 50, sqq., who has proved that the *fœnus unciarium* was $\frac{1}{12}$ of the principal, *i. e.* $8\frac{1}{3}$ per cent for the old year of ten months, and therefore 10 per cent for the civil year.

Fr. 19 (III. 1). Paulus, *Rec. Sent.* II. tit. 12, § 11: "Ex causa depositi lege XII. Tab. in duplum actio datur."

Fr. 20 (VII. 16). L. I. § 2. D. *de suspect. Tutoribus:* "Sciendum est suspecti crimen e lege XII. Tab. descendere." L. 55, § 1. D. *de Admin. et Peric. Tutor.:* "Sed si ipsi tutores

rem pupilli furati sunt, videamus, an ea actione, quæ proponitur ex lege XII. Tab. adversus tutorem in duplum, singuli in solidum teneantur."

Fr. 21 (VII. 17): PATRONUS . SI . CLIENTI . FRAUDEM . FECERIT . SACER . ESTO . (Servius, on Virgil's words, *Æneid.* VI. 609: "pulsatusve parens, et fraus innexa clienti"). I can suppose that the original had *fraudem frausus siet:* see Festus, p. 91, and Gronov. *Lect. Plaut.* p. 33, *ad Asin.* II. 2, 20.

Fr. 22 (VII. 11): QUI . SE SIERIT . TESTARIER, . LIBRIPENSVE . FUERIT, . NI . TESTIMONIUM . FARIATUR(?), . IMPROBUS . INTESTABILISQUE . ESTO . (Aul. Gell. XV. 13).

Fr. 23 (VII. 12). Aul. Gell. XX. 1: "An putas, si non illa ex XII. Tab. de testimoniis falsis pœna abolevisset, et si nunc quoque, ut antea, qui falsum testimonium dixisse convictus esset, e saxo Tarpeio dejiceretur, mentituros fuisse pro testimonio tam multos quam videmus?"

Fr. 24 (VII. 13). Pliny, in the passage quoted in Fr. 9, implies that involuntary homicide was but slightly punished. The fine in such a case seems to have been a ram (Serv. *ad Virg. Ecl.* IV. 43); and the law has been restored thus (with the help of Cic. *de Orat.* III. 39, *Top.* 17): *si quis hominem liberum dolo sciens morti dedit, parricida esto: at si telum manu fugit, pro capite occisi et natis ejus arietem subjicito.*

Fr. 25 (VII. 14). From Plin. *H. N.* XXVIII. 2, and L. 236, pr. D. *de Verb. Sign.*, the following law has been restored: QUI . MALUM . CARMEN . INCANTASSIT . [CERERI . SACER . ESTO] . [QUI] . MALUM . VENENUM . [FAXIT . DUITVE . PARRICIDA . ESTO].

Fr. 26 (IX. 6). Porcius Latro, *Declam. in Catilin.* c. 19: "Primum XII. Tabulis cautum esse cognoscimus, *ne quis in urbe cœtus nocturnos agitaret.*" Which Ursinus restores thus: *qui calim endo urbe nox coit, coiverit, capital estod.*

Fr. 27 (VIII. 2). L. 4. D. *de Colleg. et Corporibus:* "*Sodales* sunt, qui ejusdem collegii sunt; quam Græci ἑταιρίαν vocant. His autem potestatem facit lex, pactionem quam velint sibi ferre, dum ne quid ex publica lege corrumpant."

§ 15. *Tab. IX.*

Fr. 1 (IX. 1). Cicero *pro Domo,* c. 17: "Vetant XII. Tabulæ leges privis hominibus irrogari."

Fr. 2 (IX. 4). Cicero *de Legibus,* III. 19: "Tum leges

præclarissimæ de XII. Tabulis translatæ duæ: quarum . . . altera de capite civis rogari, nisi maximo comitatu, vetat." Cf. Cicero *pro Sextio*, c. 30.

Fr. 3 (IX. 3). Aul. Gell. XX. 1: "Dure autem scriptum esse in istis legibus (sc. XII. Tab.) quid existimari potest? nisi duram esse legem putas, quæ judicem arbitrumve jure datum, qui ob rem dicendam pecuniam accepisse convictus est, capite pœnitur." Cf. Cicero, *Verr. Act.* II. Lib. II. c. 32.

Fr. 4 (IX. 5). L. 2, § 23. D. *de Orig. Jur.*: "Quæstores constituebantur a populo, qui capitalibus rebus præessent: hi appellabantur *Quæstores parricidii*; quorum etiam meminit lex XII. Tabularum." Cicero *de Republ.* II. 31: "Provocationem autem etiam a regibus fuisse declarant pontificii libri, significant nostri etiam augurales; itemque ab omni judicio pœnaque provocari licere, indicant XII. Tabulæ compluribus legibus." See above, p. 201.

Fr. 5 (IX. 7). L. 3, pr. D. *ad Leg. Jul. Majestat.*: "Lex XII. Tab. jubet eum qui hostem concitaverit, quive hosti civem tradiderit, capite puniri."

§ 16. *Tab. X.*

Fr. 1 (X. 2): HOMINEM . MORTUUM . IN . URBE . NE . SEPELITO . NEVE . URITO . (Cicero *de Legibus*, II. 23).

Fr. 2 (X. 4, 5): HOC . PLUS . NE . FACITO . — ROGUM . ASCIA . NE . POLITO . (id. ibid.).

Fr. 3 and 4 (X. 6, 7): "Extenuato igitur sumtu, tribus riciniis, et vinclis purpuræ, et decem tibicinibus tollit (lex XII. Tab.) etiam lamentationem: MULIERES . GENAS . NE . RADUNTO; . NEVE . LESSUM . FUNERIS . ERGO . HABENTO." (id. ibid.). For *ricinium* (=*vestimentum quadratum*) see Fest. s. v. p. 274, and for *radere genas* (=*unguibus lacerare malas*) id. p. 273. From Servius *ad Æn.* XII. 606, it would appear that the full fragment would be: *mulieres genas ne radunto, faciem ne carpunto*, &c.

Fr. 5 (X. 8): "Cetera item funebria, quibus luctus augetur, XII. sustulerunt: HOMINI, . inquit, MORTUO . NE . OSSA . LEGITO, . QUO . POST . FUNUS . FACIAT . Excipit bellicam peregrinamque mortem" (Cic. *de Leg.* II. 24).

Fr. 6 (X. 9, 10): "Hæc præterea sunt in legibus de unctura, quibus SERVILIS . UNCTURA . tollitur, omnisque CIRCUMPOTATIO:

quæ et recte tolluntur, neque tollerentur nisi fuissent. NE . SUMTUOSA . RESPERSIO ; . NE . LONGAE . CORONAE, . NEC . ACERRAE . prætereantur" (Cic. *de Legibus*, II. 24). For *acerra* see Fest. p. 18: "*Acerra* ara quæ ante mortuum poni solebat, in qua odores incendebant. Alii dicunt arculam esse thurariam, scilicet ubi thus reponebant." Festus, s. v. *Murrata potione* (p. 158), seems also to refer to this law, which, according to Gothofredus ran thus: *Servilis unctura omnisque circumpotatio auferitor. Murrata potio mortuo ne inditor. Ne longæ coronæ, neve acerræ præferuntor.*

Fr. 7 (X. 11): QUI . CORONAM . PARIT . IPSE, . PECUNIAVE . EJUS, . VIRTUTIS . ERGO . DUITOR . EI. (Plin. *H. N.* XXI. 3; cf. Cic. *de Leg.* II. 24).

Fr. 8 (X. 12). Cic. *de Leg.* II. 24: "Ut uni plura (funera) fierent, lectique plures sternerentur, id quoque ne fieret *lege* sancitum est."

Fr. 9 (X. 13): NEVE . AURUM . ADDITO . QUOI . AURO . DENTES . VINCTI . ESCUNT, . AST . IM . CUM . ILLO . SEPELIRE . URERVE . SE . FRAUDE . ESTO . (Cic. *de Leg.* II. 24). For *se* = *sine*, see above, Tab. III. fr. 6. This fragment is interesting, because it shows the antiquity of the dentist's art. Cicero (*N. D.* III. 22, § 57) raises the first dentist to the rank of an Æsculapius: "Æsculapiorum—tertius, Arsippi et Arsinoæ, qui primus purgationem alvi *dentisque evulsionem*, ut ferunt, invenit."

Fr. 10 (X. 14). Id. ibid.: "Rogum bustumve novum vetat (lex XII. Tab.) propius LX. pedes adici ædeis alienas, invito domino."

Fr. 11 (X. 15). Id. ibid.: "Quod autem FORUM, id est vestibulum sepulchri, BUSTUMVE . USUCAPI . vetat (lex XII. Tab.) tuetur jus sepulchrorum." Comp. Festus, s. v. *Forum*, p. 84.

§ 17. *Tab. XI.*

Fr. 1 (XI. 2). Liv. IV. c. 4: "Hoc ipsum, *ne connubium patribus cum plebe esset*, non Decemviri tulerunt?" Cf. Dion. Hal. X. c. 60, XI. c. 28.

§ 18. *Tab. XII.*

Fr. 1 (XII. 1). Gaius, *Inst.* IV. § 28: "Lege autem introducta est pignoris capio, velut lege XII. Tab. adversus eum, qui hostiam emisset, nec pretium redderet; item adversus eum,

qui mercedem non redderet pro eo jumento, quod quis ideo locasset, ut inde pecuniam acceptam in dapem, id est in sacrificium, inpenderet."

Fr. 2 (XII. 4): "In lege antiqua, si servus sciente domino furtum fecit, vel aliam noxiam commisit, servi nomine actio est noxalis, nec dominus suo nomine tenetur. SI . SERVUS . FURTUM . FAXIT, . NOXIAMVE . NOCUIT." (L. II. § 1. D. *de Noxal. Actionibus*).

Fr. 3 (XII. 3): SI . VINDICIAM . FALSAM . TULIT, . STLITIS . [ET . VINDICIARUM . PRAE]TOR . ARBITROS . TRES . DATO, . EORUM . ARBITRIO . [POSSESSOR SIVE REUS] . FRUCTUS . DUPLIONE . DAMNUM . DECIDITO . (Festus, S. V. *Vindiciæ*, p. 376. I have introduced the corrections and additions of Müller). Cf. Theodos. *Cod.* IV. 18, 1.

Fr. 4 (XII. 2). L. 3. D. *de Litigios.*: "Rem, de qua controversia est, prohibemur in sacrum dedicare; alioquin dupli pœnam patimur."

Fr. 5 (XI. 1). Liv. VII. 17: "In XII. Tabulis legem esse, ut, quodcunque postremum populus jussisset, id jus ratumque esset."

§ 19. *The Tiburtine Inscription.*

These remains of the XII. Tables, though referring to an early period of Roman history, are merely quotations, and as such less satisfactory to the philological antiquary than monumental relics even of a later date. The oldest, however, of these authentic documents is not earlier than the second Samnite war. It is a *senatus-consultum*, "which gives to the Tiburtines the assurance that the senate would receive as true and valid their justification in reply to the charges against their fidelity, and that it had given no credit, even before, to these charges" (Niebuhr, *H. R.* III. p. 310, orig. p. 264, tr.)[1]. The inscription was engraved on a bronze table, which was found at Tivoli in the sixteenth century, near the site of the Temple of Hercules. About a hundred years ago it was in the possession of the Barberini family, but is now lost; at least, Niebuhr was unable to discover it, though he sought for it in all the Italian collections,

[1] Visconti supposed that this inscription was not older than the Marsian war; but there can be little doubt that Niebuhr's view is correct; see *Beschreibung der Stadt Rom*, III. pp. 125, 659.

into which the lost treasures of the house of Barberini were likely to have found their way. Niebuhr's transcript (from Gruter, p. 499), compared with Haubold's (*Monumenta Legalia*, p. 81), is as follows.

1. *L. Cornelius Cn. F. Praetor Senatum consuluit a. d.* III. *Nonas Maias sub aede Kastorus:*
2. *scr. adf.*[1] *A. Manlius A. F. Sex. Julius, L. Postumius S.*[2] *F.*
3. *Quod Teiburtes verba fecerunt, quibusque de rebus vos purgavistis, ea Senatus*
4. *animum advortit, ita utei aequom fuit: nosque ea ita audiveramus*
5. *ut vos deixsistis vobeis nontiata esse: ea nos animum nostrum*
6. *non indoucebamus ita facta esse, propter ea quod scibamus*
7. *ea vos merito nostro facere non potuisse; neque vos dignos esse,*
8. *quei ea faceretis, neque id vobeis neque rei poplicae vostrae*
9. *oitile esse facere: et postquam vostra verba Senatus audivit,*
10. *tanto magis animum nostrum indoucimus, ita utei ante*
11. *arbitrabamur, de eieis rebus af vobeis peccatum non esse.*
12. *Quonque de eieis rebus Senatuei purgatei estis, credimus, vosque*
13. *animum vostrum indoucere oportet, item vos populo*
14. *Romano purgatos fore.*

With the exception of a few peculiarities of spelling, as *af* for *ab*, *quonque* for *cumque* (comp. *-cunque*), *deixsistis* for *dixistis*, &c., there is nothing in the phraseology of this inscription

---

[1] *Scribundo adfuerunt.* [2] Niebuhr prefers *L.*

which is unclassical or obscure. The expressions *animum advertere*, "to observe," *animum inducere*, "to think," seem to belong to the conventional terminology of those days. After *fecerunt* in l. 3 we ought perhaps to add D. E. R. I. C. *i. e.* "de ea re (*patres*) ita censuerunt" (cf. Cic. *ad Fam.* VIII. 8).

§ 20. *The Epitaphs of the Scipios.*

The L. Cornelius, the son of Cnæus, who is mentioned as prætor in the inscription quoted above, is the same L. Cornelius Scipio Barbatus, whose sarcophagus is one of the most interesting monuments at Rome. The inscription upon that monument expressly states that he had been prætor. All the extant epitaphs of the Scipios have been given by Bunsen (*Beschreibung der Stadt Rom*, III. pp. 616, sqq.), who does not, however, enter upon any criticism of the text. They are as follows.

(*a*) Epitaph on L. Cornelius Scipio, who was consul in A. U. C. 456.

Cornelio' Cn. F. Scipio
Còrnéliús Lúcius | Scípió Barbátus
Gnaívod pátre prognátus | fórtis vír sapiénsque,
Quoíus fórma vírtu|teí parísuma fúit.
Cònsúl censór Aidílis | quí fúit apúd vos,
Taùrásiá' Cisaúna' | Sámnió' cépit,
Sùbígit ómne Loúcana' | ópsidésque abdoúcit[1].

(*b*) Epitaph on the son of the above, who was ædile in A. U. C. 466; consul, 494.

L. Cornelio' L. F. Scipio
Aidiles . Cosol . Cesor .
Hònc oíno' ploírumé co|séntiónt R[ománi]
Duònóro' óptumó' | fúise víro'
Lúciom Scípióne'. | Fíliós Barbáti
Cònsól, Censór, Aidíles | híc fúet a[púd vos].
Hèc cépit Córsicá' | 'Aleriá'que úrbe',
Dèdét tempéstátebus | aídé' meréto[2].

---

[1] See Arnold, *History of Rome*, II. p. 326.

[2] Bunsen, l. l.: "In return for the delivery of his fleet in a storm off Corsica he built a temple of which Ovid speaks (*Fast.* IV. 193):

Te quoque, Tempestas, *meritam* delubra fatemur,
Quum pene est Corsis diruta classis aquis."

(*c*) Epitaph on the Flamen Dialis P. Scipio, son of the elder Africanus, and adoptive father of the younger[1].

Quèi ápice', insígne diális | flámínís gesístei,
Mòrs pérfecít tua ut éssent | ómniá brévia,
Hon͡os fáma vírtúsque | glória átque ingénium.
Qui͡bus sei ín longá licuíset | tíbe útier víta,
Faci͡le fácteis súperáses | glóriám majórum.
Quà ré lubéns te in grémiu', | Scípio, récipit térra,
Públi, prógnátum | Públió, Cornéli[2].

(*d*) Epitaph on L. Cornelius Scipio, son of Cn. Hispallus, grandson of Calvus, the conqueror of Spain, and nephew of Scipio Nasica:

L. Cornelius Cn. f. Cn. n. Scipio. Magna sapientia
Multasque virtutes ætate quom parva
Posidet hoc saxsum, quoiei vita defecit non

The same passage is quoted by Funccius, *de Origine et Pueritia L. L.* p. 326.

[1] As this epitaph seems to deserve a translation, and as no one, so far as I know, has exhibited it in an English dress, the following attempt may be accepted in the want of a better:

The priestly symbol deckt thy brow:
But oh! how brief a share hadst thou
Of all this world can give.—
Honour, and fame, and noble birth,
High intellect, and moral worth:—
Had it been thine to live
A lengthened span, endowed with these,
Not all the stately memories
Of thy time-honoured knightly line
Had left a glory like to thine.
Hail! Publius, Publius Scipio's son!
Thy brief but happy course is run.
Child of the great Cornelian race,—
The grave is now thy dwelling-place:
And mother earth upon her breast
Has lulled thee lovingly to rest.

[2] Bunsen, l. l.: "Cicero bears testimony to the truth of these noble words in his *Cato Mag.* § 11: Quam fuit imbecillus Africani filius, is qui te adoptavit? Quam tenui aut nulla potius valetudine? Quod ni ita fuisset, altera ille exstitisset lumen civitatis; ad paternam enim magnitudinem animi doctrina uberior accesserat."

Honos. Honore is hic situs quei nunquam
Victus est virtutei : annos gnatus XX : is
L[aursis] . . . . datus, ne quairatis honore
Quei minus sit mand . . . .

(*e*) Epitaph on Cn. Cornelius Scipio, brother of the preceding :

Cn. Cornelius Cn. f. Scipio Hispanus
Pr. Aed. Cur. Q. Tr. mil. II. Xvir sl. judik.
Xvir sacr. fac.
Virtutes generis mieis moribus accumulavi,
Progeniem genui, facta patris petiei :
Majorum obtenui laudem ut sibei me esse creatum
Lætentur ; stirpem nobilitavit honor.

(*f*) Epitaph on L. Cornelius Scipio, son of Asiaticus, who was quæstor in 588 :

L. Corneli L. f. P. n. Scipio quaist.
Tr. mil. annos gnatus XXIII
Mortuos. Pater regem Antioco' subegit.

(*g*) Epitaph on a son of the preceding, who died young :

Cornelius L. f. L. n. Scipio Asiagenus
Comatus annoru' gnatus XVI.

(*h*) Epitaph of uncertain date, but written in very antique characters :

Aulla [sic] *Cornelia. Cn. f. Hispalli.*

It will be observed, that in these interesting monuments we have both that *anusvârah*, or dropping of the final *m*, which led to ecthlipsis (e. g. *duonoro'* for *bonorum*), and also the *visarga*, or evanescence of the nominative *s* (as in *Cornelio* for *Cornelius*). The dipththong *ai* is not always changed into *ae*, and *gnatus* has not lost its initial *g*. We may remark, too, that *n* seems not to have been pronounced before *s :* thus we have *cosol, cesor*, for *consul, censor*, according to the practice of writing *cos.* for *consul* (Diomed. p. 428, Putsch). Epitaph (*e*) has *Xvir sl. judik,,* i. e. *decemvir slitibus judikandis*, where we not only observe the initial *s* of *s[t]li[t]s = streit*, but also the *k* before *a* in *judikandis*. The phraseology, however, does not differ in any important particulars from the Latin language with which we are familiar.

The metre in which the three oldest of these inscriptions are composed is deserving of notice. That they are written in

Saturnian verse has long been perceived; Niebuhr, indeed, thinks that they "are nothing else than either complete nenias, or the beginnings of them" (*H. R.* I. p. 253). It is not, however, so generally agreed how we ought to read and divide the verses. For instance, Niebuhr maintains that *patre,* in a. 2, is "beyond doubt an interpolation;" to me it appears necessary to the verse. He thinks that there is no ecthlipsis in *apice'*, c. 1; I cannot scan the line without it. These are only samples of the many differences of opinion, which might arise upon these short inscriptions: it will therefore, perhaps, be desirable, that a few general remarks should be made on the Saturnian metre itself, and that these remarks should be applied to the epitaphs before us, which may be placed among the oldest Latin specimens of the Saturnian lay[1].

That the Saturnian metre was either a native of Italy, or naturalised there at a very early period, has been sufficiently shown by Mr. Macaulay (*Lays of Ancient Rome,* p. 23). It is, perhaps, not too much to say, that this metre,—which may be defined in its pure form as a brace of trochaic tripodiæ, preceded by an anacrusis,—is the most natural and obvious of all rhythmical intonations. There is no language which is altogether without it; though, of course, it varies in elegance and harmony with the particular languages in which it is found, and with the degree of literary advancement possessed by the poets who have written in it. The Umbrians had this verse as well as the Latins; at least there can be no doubt that the beginning of the VI. Eugubine Table is pervaded by a Saturnian rhythm, though the laws of quantity, which the Latins borrowed from the Greeks, are altogether neglected in it. The following may serve as a sample:

'Esté perskló aveís a|sériatér enétu.
Pàrfá kurnáse dérsva | peíqu peíca mérstu,
Poei ángla áseriáto est | éso trêmnu sérse.

These verses are, in fact, more regular than many of the Latin specimens. The only rule which can be laid down for the genuine Latin Saturnian is, that the *ictus* must occur three times in each member of the verse[2], and that any *thesis,* except the

[1] Livy's transcript of the inscription of T. Quinctius is confessedly imperfect; the historian says: "his *ferme* incisa litteris fuit" (VI. 29).

[2] To this necessity for a triple recurrence of the *ictus* in the genuine

last, may be omitted (see Müller, *Suppl. Annot. ad Fest.* p. 396). The *anacrusis*, at the beginning of the line, is often necessary in languages which, like the Latin and our own, have but a few words which begin with an ictus. When the Greek metres became established among the Romans, it would seem that the conventional pronunciation of many words was changed to suit the exigencies of the new versification, and no line began with an anacrusis, unless it had that commencement in the Greek model: but this appears not to have been the case in the genuine Roman verses, which begin with an unemphatic thesis whenever the convenience of the writer demands such a prefix. We have seen above (§ 2), that the first trochaic tripodia of the Saturnius *cum anacrusi*, and even an amphibrachys (= *trochæus cum anacrusi*[1]),

---

Italian metre I would refer the word *tripudium* = *triplex pulsatio*. *Pudio* meant "to strike with the foot," "to spurn" (comp. *re-pudio*). The fact is alluded to by Horace, III. *Carm.* 18, 15: "gaudet invisam pepulisse fossor *ter pede* terram."

[1] In the common books on metres this would be called a single foot, i. e. an *amphibrachys*. It appears to me that many of the difficulties, which the student has felt in his first attempts to understand the rules of metre, have been occasioned by the practice of inventing names for the residuary forms of common rhythms. Thus, the last state of the logaœdic verse is called a *choriambus;* and the student falls into inextricable confusion when he endeavours to explain to himself the concurrence of choriambi and dactyls in the commonest measures of Horace's odes. Some commentators would persuade us that we are to scan thus: *Mœce|nas atavis | edite reg|ibus;* and *Sic te | diva potens | Cypri.* But how can we connect the rhythm of the choriambus with such a termination? If we examine any of the Glyconics of Sophocles, who was considered a master in this species of verse, we shall observe that his choriambi appear in contact with dactyls and trochees, and not with iambi. Take, for instance, *Œd. Col.* 510, sqq.:

δεινὸν | μὲν τὸ πά|λαι || κείμενον | ἦ||δη κακὸν | ὦ || ξεῖν' ἐπε|γείρειν ||
ὅ|μως δ' ἔρα|μαι πυ|θέσθαι ||
τί | τοῦτο | τᾶς δειλ|αί||ας ἀπό|ρου φα|νείσας ||
ἀλ|γήδονος | ᾇ ξυν|έστας ||
μὴ | πρὸς ξενί|ας ἀν|οίξῃς ||
τᾶς | σᾶς, πέπον, | ἔργ' ἀν|αιδῆ ||
τό | τοι πολὺ | καὶ || μηδαμὰ | λῆγον ||
χρῄ|ζω, ξέν', | ὀρθὸν ἄκ|ουσμ' ἀκ|οῦσαι. ||

Here we see that the rhythm is dactylic or trochaic—these two being considered identical in some metrical systems—and that the long syllable after the dactyl is occasionally equivalent to the ictus of the trochee.

could form a verse. And conversely, if the anacrusis was wanting, the Saturnius could extend itself to a triplet of tripodiæ. We

---

We may apply the same principle to the choriambic metres in Horace, which differ only in the number of imperfect trochees which follow the dactyls in this logaœdic rhythm. Thus we have nothing but dactyls in

Sic te | díva po|téns Cypri: ||

we have one imperfect trochee or dactyl in

Sic fra|trés Hele|naé || lúcida | sídera; ||

and two imperfect feet of the same kind in

Tu ne | quaésie|rís || scíre ne|fás || quém mihi | quém tibi. ||

The cretic bears the same relation to the trochaic dipodia that the choriambus does to the dactylic dipodia, or logaœdic verse; and it was in consequence of this reduction of the trochaic dipodia to the cretic that the ancient writers on music were enabled to find a rhythmical identity between the dactyl and the trochaic dipodia (see Müller, *Liter. of Greece*, I. p. 228). It appears to me that this view of the question is calculated to settle the dispute between those who reject and those who maintain the termination of a line in the middle of a word. If every compound foot is a sort of conclusion to the rhythm, many rhythms must end in the middle of a word; and therefore such a cæsura cannot be in itself objectionable. We can hardly take any strophe in Pindar without finding some illustration of this. As a specimen, I will subjoin the first strophe of the IX. Olympian ode, with its divisions according to the rhythm:

τὸ μὲν | Ἀρχιλό|χου μέ|λος ||
φω|νᾶεν Ὀλυμπί|ᾳ || καλλί|νικος ὁ | τριπλό|ος κε|χλαδώς ||
ἄρκε|σε Κρόνι|ον παρ' || ὄχθον | ἀγεμο|νεῦσαι ||
κωμά|ζοντι φί|λοις Ἐ||φαρμόσ|τῳ σὺν ἑ|ταίροις ||
ἀλλὰ | νὺν ἑκα|ταβό||λων Μοι|σᾶν ἀπὸ | τόξων ||
Διά τε | φοινι|κοστερό|παν σεμ|νόν τ' ἐπί|νειμαι ||
ἀκρω|τήριον | Ἄλιδος ||
τοι|οίσδε βέ|λεσσιν ||
τὸ | δή ποτε | Λυδὸς | ἦ||ρως Πέ|λοψ ||
ἐ|ξάρατο | κάλ||λιστον | ἔδνον || Ἱππoδα|μείας. ||

In general, it seems unreasonable to call a number of syllables in which the ictus occurs more than once by the name of "foot" (*pes*); for the foot, so called, is defined by the stamp of the foot which marks the ictus, and therefore, as above suggested, the half-Saturnius would be called *tri-pudium*, because it consisted of three feet. For instance, if Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος had no ictus except on the first and fourth syllables of Ἀρχιλόχου we might scan it as two dactyls; but if, as the analogy of -νᾶεν Ὀλυμπίᾳ would seem to indicate, it had an ictus on the last syllable of μέλος, we must scan the words as a dactyl + trochee + ictus. This method of considering the Greek metres is exemplified in the Prosody of the *Complete Greek Grammar*. Lond. 1848.

have instances of both practices in the old Latin translation of an epigram, which was written, probably by Leonidas of Tarentum, at the dedication of the spoils taken in the battles of Heraclea and Asculum (B. C. 280, 279), and which should be scanned as follows:

Quì ántedhác invícti | fúvére víri | páter óptime Olýmpi ||
Hòs égo in púgna víci ||
Vìctúsque súm ab ísdem ||[1].

Niebuhr suggests (III. note 841) that the first line is an attempt at an hexameter, and the last two an imitation of the shorter verse; and this remark shows the discernment which is always so remarkable in that great scholar. The author of this translation, which was probably made soon after the original, could not write in hexameter verse, but he represented the hexameter of the original by a lengthened form of the Saturnius, and indicated the two penthemimers of the pentameter by writing their meaning in two truncated Saturnians, taking care to indicate by the *anacrusis* that there was really a break in the rhythm of the original pentameter, although it might be called a single line according to the Greek system of metres.

To return, however, to the epitaphs of the Scipios. The scansion of the lines, which I have adopted, is sufficiently indicated by the metrical marks placed over the words. It is only necessary to add a few explanatory observations. With the exception of a. 2, 3, b. 3, and c. 7, every line begins with an anacrusis, or unaccentuated thesis; and it seems to be a matter of indifference whether this is one long or two short syllables. The vowel *i* is often pronounced like *y* before a vowel, as in *Lúcyus* (a. 1), *Lúcyom* (b. 3), *dyális* (c. 1), *brévya* (c. 2), *ingényum* (c. 3), *útyer* (c. 4), *grémyu* (c. 6), *Scípyo* (ibid.). And *u* is pronounced like *w* in c. 2. The rules of synalœpha and ecthlipsis are sometimes attended to (as in a. 6), and sometimes neglected (as in b. 5, c. 4). The quantity of *fúisse* and *víro*' in b. 2, may be justified on general principles; for *fuisse* is properly *fuvisse*, and *viro* is written *veiro* in Umbrian. But there is no consistency in the syllabic measurement of the words in these rude

---

[1] The lost original may have been as follows:
τοὺς πρὶν ἀνικήτους, πάτερ αἰγλήεντος Ὀλύμπου,
μαρνάμενός τ' ἐκράτουν, οἵ τ' ἐκράτησαν ἐμέ.

lines. *Facile*, in c. 5, makes a thesis in consequence of that short pronunciation which is indicated by the old form *facul* (Fest. p. 87, Müller). As all the other verbs in epitaph a. are in the perfect tense, it seems that *subigit* and *abdoucit*, in the last line, must be perfect also. *Indoucimus* is perhaps a perfect in the Tiburtine inscription (l. 10): "postquam senatus audivit, tanto magis—*indoucimus*;" and *subigit* was probably pronounced *sŭbĭgĭt*. The beginning of b. seems to have been the conventional phraseology in these monumental nenias. The sepulchre of A. Attilius Calatinus, which stood near those of the Scipios at the *Porta Capena* (Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* I. 7, § 13), bore an inscription beginning in much the same way:

Hònc oíno ploírumé co|séntiónt géntes.
Populí primáriúm | fúísse vírum.

(Comp. Cic. *de Finibus*, II. 35, § 116; *Cato M.* 17, 61).

§ 21. *The Columna Rostrata.*

The *Columna Rostrata*, as it is called, was found at the foot of the Capitol in the year 1565. Its partial destruction by lightning is mentioned by Livy (XLII. 20); and it was still standing, probably in the existing copy, when Servius wrote (*ad Virgil. Georg.* III. 29). It refers to the well-known exploits of C. Duilius, who was consul B.C. 260, A.U.C. 494. This inscription, with the supplements of Ciacconi, and a commentary, was published by Funck, in his treatise *de Orig. et Puer. L. L.* pp. 302, sqq. It is here given with the restorations of Grotefend (Orelli, no. 549).

[C. Duilios, M. F. M. N. Consol advorsum Poenos en Siceliad Sicest]ano[s socios Rom. obsidioned crave]d exemet leciones r[efecet dumque Poenei m]aximosque[1] *macistratos l[ecionumque duceis ex n]ovem castreis exfociunt Macel[am opidom opp]ucnandod cepet enque eodem mac*

[1] As it is said that *maxumus* was the prevalent form before Cæsar's time, this more recent spelling may indicate that the inscription is not in its original condition.

[istratod bene r]em navebos marid consol primos c[eset socios] clasesque navales primos ornavet pa[ravetque] cumque eis navebos claseis Poenicas om[neis et maxi]sumas copias Cartaciniensis praesente[d sumod] Dictatored ol[or]om in altod marid pucn[ad vicet] XXX*que navi[s cepe]t cum socieis septem[milibos quinresm]osque triresmosque naveis* [XIV. *merset. tonc aur]om captom numei* ⊕ ⊕ ⊕ *DC . . . . [pondod arcen]tom captom prœda numei* CCCIↃↃↃ [*pondod crave*] *captom aes* CCCIↃↃↃ CCCIↃↃↃ CCCIↃↃↃ

Si quis magistratus adversus hac d. m. pondera modiosque vasaque publica modica, majora, minorave faxit, jusseritve(5) *fieri, dolumve adduit quo ea fiant, eum quis volet magistratus*(6) *multare, dum minore parti familias taxat*(7), *liceto; sive quis im*(8) *sacrum judicare voluerit, liceto.*"

The Latinity of this fragment requires a few remarks. (1) *coæquetur.* In the Pompeian Inscription (Orelli, no. 4348) we have: *mensuras exæquandas.* (2) *Sedulum.* Scaliger suggests *se dolo m.* i. e. *sine dolo malo.* But *sedulo* or *sedulum* itself signifies "sine fraude indiligentiæve culpa" (Müller *ad l.*), and the law refers to the care and honesty of those who were to test the weights and measures. For *sedulus,* see Döderl. *Syn. u. Et.* I. p. 118. (3) "Nihil intelligo nisi *librarius* qui hic significatur *sextarius frumenti* erat." Müller. (4) *Sex dequimque = sex decimque,* the *qu* being written instead of *c.* (5) The editions have *jussit ve re,* for which Müller writes *jussitve;* Haubold (*Monumenta Legalia*) proposes *jusseritve,* "propter sequens *re;*" and I have adopted this reading on account of the word *faxit,* which precedes. (6) *Quis volet magistratus.* Cf. *Tab. Bantin. Osc.* 12. *Lat.* 7. (7) *Dum minore parti familias taxat.* Compare the Latin Bantine Inscription, l. 10: [dum minoris] *partus familias taxsat.* Cato, *apud Aul. Gell.* VII. 3: "Quæ lex est tam acerba quæ dicat, si quis illud facere voluerit, mille nummi *dimidium familiæ* multa esto?" The abl. *parti* (which occurs in Lucretius) and the genitive *partus* (comp. *Castorus* in the Bantine Inscription, *ejus, cujus,* &c.) depend on *multare* and *multam,* which are implied in the sentence. For *taxat,* see Fest. p. 356. These passages show the origin of the particle *dumtaxat,* which is used by the classical writers to signify "provided one estimates it," "estimating it accurately," "only," "at least," "so far as that goes," &c.[1] (8) *Im = eum.* Fest. p. 103.

The *Lex Papiria de Sacramento,* which is to be referred to the year B.C. 243, A.U.C. 511, is thus cited by Festus s. v. *Sacra-*

[1] It is scarcely necessary to point out the absurdity of the derivation proposed by A. Grotefend (*Ausf. Gramm. d. Lat. Spr.* § 124): "*duntaxat* aus *dum taceo* (cetera) *sat* (est hoc)!"

mentum, p. 344: "Sacramentum æs significat, quod pœnæ nomine penditur, sive eo quis interrogatur, sive contenditur. Id in aliis rebus quinquaginta assium est, in aliis rebus quingentorum inter eos, qui judicio inter se contenderent. Qua de re lege L. Papiri Tr. pl. sanctum est his verbis:

> *Quicunque Praetor post hac factus erit qui inter cives jus dicet, tres viros Capitales populum rogato, hique tres viri* [*capitales*], *quicunque* [*posthac fa*]*cti erunt, sacramenta ex*[*igunto*], *judicantoque, eodemque jure sunto, uti ex legibus plebeique scitis exigere, judicareque, esseque oportet.*"

To these may be added the old *Edictum ædilium curulium de Mancipiis Vendundis*, quoted by Gellius, *N. A.* IV. 2:

> *Titulus servorum singulorum utei scriptus sit, cærato ita, utei intellegi recte possit, quid morbi vitiive quoique sit, quis fugitivus errove sit, noxave solutus non sit.*

§ 23. *The Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus.*

The *Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus*, which is referred to by Livy (XXXIX. 14), and which belongs to the year B.C. 186, A.U.C. 568, was found at *Terra de Teriolo* in Calabria, in 1640, and is now at Vienna. A facsimile of the inscription, with the commentary of Matthæus Ægyptius, will be found in Drakenborch's *Livy*, Vol. VII. pp. 197, sqq.

1. [*Q.*] *Marcius L. F. S. Postumius L. F. Cos. Senatum consoluerunt N.*[1] *Octob. apud aedem*
2. *Duelonai sc.*[2] *arf.*[3] *M. Claudi M.F. L. Valeri P. F. Q. Minuci C. F. De Bacanalibus, quei foideratei*
3. *Esent, ita exdeicendum censuere. Neiquis eorum Sacanal*[4] *habuise velet; sei ques*[5]

---

[1] *Nonis.* [2] *scribundo.* [3] *adfuerunt.* [4] *Bacchanal.*
[5] *ques* = *quei.* See Klenze, *Legis Serviliæ Fr.* p. 12, not. 2; Fest. p. 261.

4. *esent, quei sibei deicerent necesus*[1] *ese Bacanal habere, eeis utei ad pr. urbanum*
5. *Romam venirent, deque eeis rebus, ubei eorum vtr a*[2] *audita esent, utei senatus*
6. *noster decerneret, dum ne minus senatoribus* C. *adesent [quom e]a res cosoleretur.*
7. *Bacas*[3] *vir ne quis adiese*[4] *velet ceivis Romanus, neve nominus Latin[i], neve socium*
8. *quisquam, nisei pr. urbanum adiesent, isque de senatuos sententiad, dum ne*
9. *minus senatoribus* C. *adesent, quom ea res cosoleretur, iousisent, censuere.*
10. *Sacerdos ne quis vir eset, magister neque vir neque mulier quisquam eset,*
11. *neve pecuniam quisquam eorum comoinem habuise velet, neve magistratum*
12. *neve promagistratud, neque virum neque mulierem quiquam*[5] *fecise velet,*
13. *neve post hac inter sed*[6] *conjourase neve comvovise neve conspondise*
14. *neve conpromesise velet, neve quisquam fidem inter sed dedise velet,*
15. *sacra in oquoltod*[7] *ne quisquam fecise velet neve in poplicod neve in*
16. *preivatod, neve exstrad urbem sacra quisquam fecise velet, nisei*
17. *pr. urbanum adieset, isque de senatuos sententiad, dum ne minus*
18. *senatoribus* C. *adesent quom ea res cosoleretur, iousisent, censuere.*
19. *Homines plous* V. *oinvorsei*[8]*, virei atque mulieres, sacra ne quisquam*

---

[1] *necessum.* [2] l. *utra verba.* [3] i. e. *Bacchas.* [4] *adiisse.*
[5] *quisquam.* [6] i. e. *se* as in l. 14. [7] *occulto.* [8] *universi.*

20. *fecise velet, neve inter ibei*[1] *virei plous duobus, mulieribus plous tribus,*
21. *arfuise velent, nisei de pr. urbani senatuosque sententiad utei suprad*
22. *scriptum est. Haice utei in coventionid*[2] *exdeicatis ne minus trinum*
23. *noundinum, senatuosque sententiam utei scientes esetis, eorum*
24. *sententia ita fuit. Sei ques*[3] *esent quei arvorsum ead fecisent quam suprad*
25. *scriptum est, eeis rem caputalem faciendam censuere, atque utei*
26. *hoce in tabolam ahenam inceideretis. Ita senatus aiquom censuit.*
27. *Uteique eam figier joubeatis ubei facilumed*[4] *gnoscier potisit*[5]*, atque*
28. *utei ea Bacanalia, sei qua sunt exstrad quam sei quid ibei sacri est,*
29. *ita utei suprad scriptum est, in diebus* X *quibus vobeis tabelai*[6] *datai*
30. *erunt, faciatis utei dismota sient. In agro Teurano*[7]*.*

§ 24. *The Old Roman Law on the Bantine Table.*

The Roman law on the Bantine Table is probably not older than the middle of the seventh century. The chief reason for introducing it here, is its connexion in locality, if not in import, with the most important fragment of the Oscan language (above, p. 116). Mommsen divides it into six, Klenze into four sections. His transcription and supplements (*Rhein. Mus.* for 1828, pp. 28, sqq.; *Phil. Abhandl.* pp. 7, sqq.), compared with those of Mommsen (*Untevital. Dialekte,* pp. 140, sqq.), give the following results:

---

1 = *interea.* 2 *contione.* 3 *ques* = *quei.*
4 *facillime.* 5 = *potis-sit* = *possit.* 6 = *tabellæ.*
7 *in agro Teurano.* Strabo, p. 254 C: *ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν Θουρίων καὶ ἡ Ταυριάνη χώρα λεγομένη ἵδρυται.*

CAP. 1. On the degradation of offenders.

1. [*n*]*eque prov*[*inciam*]
2. *in sena*[*tu seiv*]*e in poplico joudicio ne sen*[*tentiam rogato tabellamve nei dato*]
3. . . . *deicit*]*o, neive quis mag. testumonium poplice eid*[*em deferri neive den*]*ontiari*
4. . . . [*sinito neive joudicem eum neive arbitrum neive recipe*]*ratorem dato, neive is in poplico luuci praetextam neive soleas habeto neive quis*
5. [*mag. prove. mag. prove quo imperio potestateve erit qu*]*eiquomque comitia conciliumve habebit eum sufragium ferre nei sinito*
6. [*neive eum censor in senatum legito neive in senatu*] *relinquito.*

L. 3. See Quinctil. V. 7, § 9: "Duo sunt genera testium, aut *voluntariorum* aut quibus in judiciis publicis *lege denuntiatur*."

L. 4. *luuci*, "by day." Plaut. *Cas.* IV. 2, 7: "Tandem ut veniamus *luci*." Cic. *Phil.* XII. 10, § 25: "Quis audeat *luci*—illustrem aggredi?"

CAP. 2. On the punishment of judges and senators who violate the law.

7. [*Seiquis joudex queiquomque ex hace lege*] *plebeive scito factus erit senatorve fecerit gesseritve quo ex hace lege*
8. [*minus fiant quae fieri oportet quaeve fieri oportu*] *erit oportebitve non fecerit sciens d. m., seive advorsus hance legem fecerit*
9. [*gesseritve sciens d. m.; ei multa tanta esto HS. . . eamque pequniam*] *quei volet magistratus exsigito. Sei postulabit quei petet pr. recuperatores*
10. [*quos, quotque dari opor*]*teat dato jubetoque eum sei ita pariat, condumnari populo, facitoque joudicetur. Sei condemnatus*
11. [*erit, quanti condemnatus erit, prædes*] *ad q. urb.*

det aut bona ejus poplice possideantur facito. Seiquis mag. multam inrogare volet,

12. [*ei multam inrogare liceto, dum minoris*] *partus familias taxsat liceto; eiq. omnium rerum siremps lex esto, quasei sei is haace lege*

13. [*multam HS....exegisset.*]

12. *dum minoris partus familias taxsat.* See above, § 22, on the Lex Silia. *Partus* is the genitive case, like *Castorus*, cap. 3, l. 17. *Siremps* is explained by Festus, p. 344: "*Siremps* ponitur pro eadem, vel, proinde ac ea, quasi *similis res ipsa*. Cato in dissuadendo legem . . . relicta est: Et præterea rogas, quemquam adversus ea si populus condempnaverit, uti siremps lex siet, quasi adversus leges fecisset."

CAP. 3. On binding the judges and magistrates by an oath to observe the law.

14. [*Cos. pr. aid. tr. pl. q.* IIIvir. *cap.* IIIvir. *a. d. a. qu*] *ei nunc est, is in diebus* V *proxsumeis, quibus queique eorum sciet h. l. popolum plebemve*

15. [*joussisse jouranto utei infra scriptum est. Item dic. cos. pr. mag. eq. cens. aid. tr. pl. q.* IIIvir *cap.* IIIvir *a. d. a. joudex ex h. l. plebive scito*

16. [*factus queiquomque eorum p*]*osthac factus erit, eis in diebus* V *proxsumeis quibus quisque eorum mag. inperiumve inierit, jouranto*

17. *utei infra scriptum est. Eidem consistunto in ae*] *de Castorus palam luci in forum vorsus, et eidem in diebus* V *apud q. jouranto per Jovem deosque*

18. [*penateis, sese quae ex h. l. facere oport*]*ebit facturum, neque sese advorsum h. l. facturum scientem d. m. neque seese facturum neque intercesurum*

19. [*quo quæ ex h. l. oportet minus fiant. Qu*]*ei ex h. l. non jouraverit, is magistratum inperiumve nei petito neive gerito neive habeto, neive in senatu*

20. [*si adfuerit sententiam dicere e*]*um quis sinito neive eum censor in senatum legito. Quei ex h. l. joudicaverit, is facito apud q. urb.*

21. [*nomen ejus quei jouraverit sc*]*riptum siet, quaestorque ea nomina accipito et eos quei ex h. l. apud sed jourarint facito in taboleis*

22. [*popliceis scriptos habeat*].

L. 15. i. e. *Dictator, consul, prætor, magister equitum, censor, ædilis, tribunus plebei, quæstor, triumvir capitalis, triumvir agris dandis adsignandis.*

L. 17. *palam luci in forum versus.* See Cic. *de Offic.* III. 24.

Cap. 4. On the oath of the senators.

23. [*Quei senator est inve senatu sententi*]*am deixer*[*in*]*t post hance legem rogatam, eis in diebus* X *proxsumeis, quibus quisque* [*eorum sciet h. l.*]

24. [*populum plebemve joussisse, j*]*ouranto apud quaestorem ad aerarium palam luci per Jovem de* [*osqu*]*e penate*[*is sese quæ ex h. l.*

25. [*facere oportebit facturum, neque see*]*se advorsum hance legem facturum esse, neque seese*

26. — — *se hoice leegei fi* — —

27. — — *anodni uraver.*

L. 23. *eis = is.*

L. 24. *ad ærarium.* See Liv. XXIX. 37. Per *Jovem deosque penateis.* Comp. Cic. *Acad.* IV. 20.

Cap. 5.

28. — — *e quis magistratus, p.*

29. — — —

Cap. 6.

30. — — [*u*]*ti in taboleis popl*[*iceis*]

31. — — [*tr*]*inum nondin*[*um*]

32. — — *is eritun.*

CHAPTER VII.

ANALYSIS OF THE LATIN ALPHABET.

§ 1. Organic classification of the original Latin alphabet. § 2. The labials. § 3. The gutturals. § 4. The dentals. § 5. The vowels. § 6. The Greek letters used by the Romans. § 7. The numeral signs.

§ 1. *Organic Classification of the Original Latin Alphabet.*

THE genuine Latin alphabet,—or that set of characters which expressed in writing the sounds of the Roman language before it had borrowed from the Greek a number of words, and the means of exhibiting them to the eye,—may be considered as consisting of nineteen letters; that is, of the representatives of the original Cadmean syllabarium (which consisted of sixteen letters), with an appendix comprising the secondary vowels, or vocalised consonants, I and U, and the secondary sibilant X = *sh*.

If we distribute these nineteen letters according to their natural or organic classification, we shall have the following arrangement:—

CONSONANTS.

	Labials.	Gutturals.	Dentals.
Medials . . .	B	G	D
Aspirates . .	F	H	R
Tenues . . .	P	Qv	T
Liquids . . .	M		L, N.
Sibilants . .		S, X	

VOWELS.

Vowels of Articulations	Heaviest. A	Lightest. E	Medium. O
Vocalised Consonants	Vocalised Labial. U	Vocalised Guttural, or Dental. I	

It will be most convenient, as well as most methodical, to consider these letters according to this classification, which will be justified by the investigation itself.

§ 2. *The Labials.*

The labials consist of three mutes and the liquid M. The regular changes of the labial mutes, in the principal languages of the Indo-Germanic family, have been thus indicated by James Grimm, to whom we owe the discovery of a most important law (*Deutsche Gramm.* I. p. 584[1]), which may be stated thus in its application to all three orders of mutes:

In Greek, Latin, Sanscrit.		In Gothic.		In Old High German.
Medial	corresponds to	*Tenuis*	and to	*Aspirate.*
Aspirate	„ „	*Medial*	„	*Tenuis.*
Tenuis	„ „	*Aspirate*	„	*Medial.*

This law, applied to the labials only, may be expressed in the following table:

Latin, (Greek, Sanscrit) .	B	F	P
Gothic	P	B	F
Old High German . . .	F	P	B (V)

To take the instances given by Grimm himself,—the first column is confirmed, as far as the Latin language is concerned, by the following examples: *cannabis* (κάνναβις), Old Norse *hanpr*, Old High German *hanaf; turba* (θορύβη), Goth. *thaúrp*, O. H. G. *dorof; stabulum*, O. N. *stöpull*, O. H. G. *staphol.* To which may be added, *labi*, Anglo-Saxon *slipan*, O. H. G. *sliuffan.* These instances are confined to the occurrence of the labials in the middle of words; for there are no German words beginning with P, and no H. G. words beginning with F.

The second column is supported as follows: Initials—*fagus* (φηγός), O. N. *beyki*, O. H. D. *puocha; fero* (φέρω), Goth. *baíra*, O. H. G. *piru; fui* (φύω), Ang.-Sax. *bëon*, O. H. G. *pim; flare*, Goth. *blasan*, O. H. G. *plasan; fra-n-gere* (ῥήγνυμι), Goth. *brikan*, O. H. G. *prëchan; folium* (φύλλον), O. N. *blad*, O. H. G. *plat; frater* (φρητήρ), Goth. *brothar*, O. H. G. *pruoder.*

---

[1] Mr Guest maintains that this celebrated law is invalidated by very serious exceptions (*Proceedings of the Philol. Soc.* III. pp. 179, sqq.)

The Latin language furnishes no instances of this rule in its application to the middle sounds. In *νεφέλη*, *κεφαλή*, *γράφειν* and such like, the Latin equivalents present *b* or *p*; compare *nebula*, *caput*, *s-cribere*. The reason for this is to be sought in the aversion of the Roman ear from F as a middle sound.

The third column rests on the following induction: Initials—*pes* (*pedis*), Goth. *fôtus*, O. H. G. *vuoz*; *piscis*, Goth. *fisks*, O. H. G. *visc*; *pater*, Goth. *fadrs*, O. H. G. *vatar*; *plenus*, Goth. *fulls*, O. H. G. *vol*; *pecus*, Goth. *faihu*, O. H. G. *vihu*; *palma*, Angl.-Sax. *folma*, O. H. G. *volma*; *pellis*, Goth. *fill*, O. H. G. *vël*; *pullus*, Goth. *fula*, O. H. G. *volo*; *primus*, Goth. *frumists*, O. H. G. *vromist*. Middle sounds—*sopor*, O. N. *svefn*, O. Sax. *suèlhan*; *septem*, Angl.-Sax. *sëfon*, Goth. *sibun*; *afer*, Angl.-Sax. *ëofor*, O. H. G. *ëbar*; *super*, Goth. *ufar*, O. N. *yfir*, O. H. G. *ubar*; *rapina*, Angl.-Sax. *reáf*, O. H. G. *roub*.

These may be taken as proofs of the general application of Grimm's rule to the Latin labials. If, however, we examine the use of the separate letters more minutely, we shall find great vacillation even within the limits of the Latin language itself.

The medial B seems to have approximated in many cases to the sound of V; at other times it came more nearly to P. We find in old Latin the forms *Duillius*, *duonus*, *duellum*, &c. by the side of *Billius*, *bonus*, *bellum*, &c. Now, there is no doubt that the proper abbreviation of these forms would be e. g. *donus* or *vonus*, and so on. The labial representative *bonus*, therefore, shows a sort of indifference between the occasional pronunciation of B and V. This view is confirmed by a comparison of *duis*, which must have been the original form, with *δίς* on the one hand, and *bis*, *bes*, *vi-ginti* on the other. The same appears particularly in the change from Latin to Italian or French, as in *habere*=*avere*=*avoir*, *habebam*=*aveva*=*avois*, *Aballo*=*Avalon*, *Cabellio*=*Cavaillon*, *Eburovices*=*Evreux*, &c., or conversely, as in *Vesontio* = *Besançon*. The commutation of *b* and *v* in the Spanish language gave occasion to Scaliger's epigram:

Haud temere antiquas mutat Vasconia voces
Cui nihil est aliud vivere quam bibere[1].

---

[1] *Penny Cycl.* III. p. 220. See also Scaliger *de Caus. L. L.* I. c. 14. p. 36. In older Latin we have *Fovii* by the side of *Fabii* (Fest. p. 87), *Sevini* by the side of *Sabini* (Plin. *H. N.* III. 12), *Stovenses* by the side of

The interchange of B and P may be remarked in *burrus*, *πυρ-ρός*; *Balantium*, *Palatium*; *bitumen*, *pitumen* (comp. *pituita*); &c. In many Latin words the B stands for a *φ* (=P'H) in the Greek synonym: compare *balæna*, *albus*, *ambo*, *nebula*, *umbilicus*, &c., with *φάλαινα*, *ἀλφός*, *ἄμφω*, *νεφέλη*, *ὀμφαλός*, &c.

The ancient Romans did not use B, as the Greeks did, to form a fulcrum between two liquids (comp. *μεσημερία*, *μεσημβρία*; *μέλι*, [*μ*]*βλίττω*; *ἔ-μολον*, *μέμβλωκα*; *μόρος*, *ἄμβροτος*; &c.): but in the derivative idioms there are many instances of this insertion; compare *numerus*, *nombre*; *camera*, *chambre*; &c.; and even when *r* is substituted for some other liquid, as in *hominem*, Sp. *hombre*; or when a third liquid is retained, as in *cumulare*, Fr. *combler*.

In classical Latin B is often omitted when flanked by two vowels; this is particularly the case in the dative or ablative plural, as in *queis* by the side of *quibus*, *filiis* by the side of *filiabus*, &c.; indeed this omission is regular in the second declension.

It is hardly necessary to remark, that the genuine Etruscan element in the Latin language must have been altogether without the medial B. As a final, B is found only in the proclitic words *ab*, *ob*, *sub*.

When B or V is followed by the vocalised guttural J, we sometimes remark that, in the derived languages, this guttural supersedes the labial, and is pronounced alone, or with an assimilation; so we have *cavea* (= *cavja*), *cage*; *cambiare*, *changer*; *debeo*, *deggio*; *Dibio*, *Dijon*; *objectum*, *oggetto*; *rabies*, *rage*; *rubere* (=*rubjere*), *rougir*; *subjectum*, *sujet*; &c. We see the full development of this change in such words as *nager* from *navigare*, while the absolute omission of the labial is justified by *écrire* from *scribere*, in *Amiens* from *Ambiani*, and in *aimois*, which comes from *amabam* through *aimoy*=*amoue*=*amava*, (Lewis, *On the Romance Languages*, p. 199).

The labial F and the guttural Qv are the most characteristic letters in the Latin alphabet. Of the latter I will speak in its place, merely remarking here that its resemblance to F consists in

---

Stobenses, and in the flexion-forms of the verb *-bo*, *-bam*, *-bilis*, *-bundus*, by the side of *-vi*, from *fio* and *fui* (see Corssen, *Zeitschr. f. Vergl. Sprf.* 1852. p. 17).

the fact that they are both compound letters, although used from the earliest period as exponents of simple sounds.

In considering the Latin F, we must be careful not to confuse it with the Greek φ on the one hand, or with the modern V on the other. It is true that F corresponds to φ in a number of words, such as *fagus, fama, fero, fallo, fari, fascis, frater, frigus, fucus, fugio, fui, fulgeo, fur* (Müller, *Etrusk.* I. p. 20); but we must consider these words as an approach to a foreign articulation; for in a great number of words, in which the F has subsequently been commuted for H, we can find no trace of connexion with the Greek φ: such are *fariolus, fasena, fedus, fircus, folus, fordeum, fostis, fostia, forctis, vefo, trafo* (Müller, *Etrusk.* I. p. 44).

It is generally laid down that F and V are both labio-dental aspirates, and that they differ only as the tenuis differs from the medial; and one philologer has distinctly asserted their identity, meaning perhaps that in Latin F=the English V, and U=the English W. If, however, we analyse some of the phenomena of comparative philology in which the Latin F appears, and then refer to Quintilian's description of the sound of this letter, we may be disposed to believe that in many cases the English V formed only a part of the sound. Quintilian says (XII. 10, §§ 27, 29) that the Roman language suffered in comparison with the Greek from having only V and F, instead of the Greek υ and φ, "*quibus nullæ apud eos* (*Græcos*) *dulcius spirant. Nam et illa, quæ est sexta nostrarum, pæne non humana voce vel omnino non voce potius inter discrimina dentium efflanda est: quæ etiam, cum vocalem proxima accipit, quassa quodammodo: utique, quoties aliquam consonantem frangit, ut in hoc ipso* FRANGIT, *multo fit horridior.*" Not to repeat here what has been stated at length elsewhere (*N. Crat.* § 111), it will be sufficient to make the following observations: (*a*) the Latin F, though not =V, contained that letter, and was a cognate sound with it[1]: this is proved by a comparison of *con-ferre, con-viva,* &c. with *com-bibere, im-primis,* &c. (*b*) It appears from

[1] In the same way as F seems to represent φ in the instances cited above, V also appears as a substitute both for φ and π. Compare *valgus, vallus, veru, virgo,* and *vitricus,* with φολκός, *palus,* πείρω, παρθένος, and *pater* (Buttman, *Lexil.* s. v. φολκός).

Quintilian that in his time the Latin F contained, in addition to the labial V, some dental sibilant; and the sibilant is known to have been the condition in which the guttural passed into the mere aspirate. (*c*) A comparison of the Greek *θήρ* with its Latin synonym *fera* would produce great difficulty, if we could not suppose a coexistence of the sibilant with the labial in the latter; such a concurrence we have in the Russian synonym *svera*, Lettish *svehrs*, Old Prussian *svirs*. (*d*) The Sabine words mentioned above (such as *fircus*), the more modern representatives of which substitute an aspirate for the F, prove that the F must have contained a guttural aspirate; for no labial can pass into a guttural, though a compound of labial and guttural may be represented by the guttural only. (*e*) Those words in the Romance languages which present an aspirate for the F, which their Latin synonyms retained to the last,—such as *falco*, "hawk;" *foris*, Fr. "hors;" *facere*, *formosus*, *fumus*, &c., Sp. "hacer," "hermoso," "humo," &c.,—prove that, to the last, the Latin F contained some guttural element, in addition to the labial of which it was in part composed. It seems to me that F must have been SV, or, ultimately, HV, and that V must have corresponded to our English W. With regard to the Greek *φ*, there can be no doubt that it was a distinct *p'h*, like the middle sound in *hap-hazard*, *shep-herd;* reduplications like *πέφυκα* (*pe-p'huka*), and contacts like *Σαπφώ* (*Sapp'ho*), sufficiently prove this. The forms of Latin words which seem to substitute F for this *φ* must be referred to the Pelasgian element in the Latin language: the Tuscans, as we have seen, were by no means averse from this sound; and the Romans were obliged to express it by the written representative of a very different articulation.

The derivation of *Falerii* and *Falis-ci* (cf. *Etruria* and *Etrusci*) from a founder *Halesus*, shows that even among the Tuscans there was an intimate affinity between F and H (see Müller, *Etr.* II. p. 273).

Of the tenuis P it is not necessary to say much. If we compare the Latin forms with their Greek equivalents, we observe that P, or PP, is used as a substitute for the *φ* (P'H) of which I have just spoken. Thus *puniceus*, *caput*, *prosper*, &c., correspond to *φοινίκεος*, *κεφάλη*, *πρόσφορος*, &c., and *cruppellarii*, *cippus*, *-lappa*, *stroppus*, *supparum*, *s-cloppus*, *topper*, &c., answer to

κεκρύφαλος, κέφαλον, ἀκαλήφη, στρόφιον, ὑφασία, κόλαφος, σ-τυφρός, σ-τυφελός (*tapfer*), &c.

In the languages derived from the Latin, P very often passes into V. This is most regular in the French: comp. *aperire, aprilis, capillus, capistrum, capra, episcopus, habere, juniperus, lepus, nepos, opera, pauper, recipere, sepelire, sapere*, &c., with *ouvrir, avril, cheveu, chevêtre, chèvre, évêque, avoir, genièvre, lièvre, neveu, œuvre, pauvre, recevoir, en-sevelir, savoir*, &c.[1]

P is often inserted as a fulcrum to the labial M when a liquid follows: thus we have *sumo, sum-p-si, sumptus; promo, prom-p-si, promptus.*

Contact with the guttural J will convert P into CH=J or a soft G. Compare *rupes, roche; sapiam, sache; sapiens, sage*, &c. Here in effect the labial is assimilated or absorbed, as in *Rochester* from *Hrof-ceastre.*

The labial liquid M occasionally takes the place of one or other of the labial mutes, even within the limits of the Latin language itself. It stands by the side of B in *glomus, hiems, melior, tumeo*, &c., compared with *globus, hibernus, bonus* (*benus, bene, bellus*, &c., *βελτίων, βέντιστος*, &c.), *tuber*, &c. We find a substitution of B for M in *Bandela*, the modern name of *Mandela* (Orelli *ad Hor.* III. *Carm.* 18, 12), and in *Lubedon* for *Laomedon* (Scaliger, *de Caussis L. L.* I. c. 22, p. 54). I am not aware that we have any example of the commutation of M with the labio-dental F. With V it is not uncommon: comp. *Mulciber, Vulcanus; pro-mulgare, pro-vulgare*, (compare *di-vulgare*); &c. This is still more remarkable if we extend the comparison to cognate languages: thus *Mars, mas* (*maris*), may be compared with Fάρης, Fάῤῥην, *vir, virtus*, "war," *wehren*, "warrior," Ὀαρίων; and *Minne*, "Minion," &c., with *Venus, Winnes-jäfte*, &c. (*Abhandl. Berl. Ak.* 1826, p. 58).

---

[1] To avoid unnecessary trouble (for independent dictionary-hunting would have led, in most cases, to a repetition of the same results) I have taken several of the commonest comparisons of French and Latin synonyms from the articles on the separate consonants in the *Penny Cyclopædia*. It is scarcely worth while to make this reference, for no one acquainted with French and Latin need go to the *Penny Cyclopædia*, or any other compilation, in order to learn that *ouvrir, avril*, &c. are derived from *aperire, aprilis*, &c.

So also μά-ν-τις may be compared with *vates;* at least, Plautus writes *mantiscinari* for *vaticinari.* The changes of P into M are generally observable in assimilations such as *summus* for *supimus, supremus:* in Greek, and in the passage between Greek and Latin, this change is common enough; thus we have μετά by the side of πέδα, and μόλυβδος by the side of *plumbum.* In fact, M and N are more nearly akin to the medials B and D than to the tenues, and a thick articulation will always give the medials for the liquids.

At the end of Latin words M is very often omitted in writing, and seems to have been still more frequently neglected in pronunciation. With regard to the written omissions, it was the rule to omit in the present tense of active verbs the important M which characterises the first person in many of the other tenses. In fact, the only verbs which retain it in the present tense are *su-m* and *inqua-m:* and it is mentioned as a custom of Cato the Censor, that he used also to elide the M at the termination of the futures of verbs in *-o* and *-io* (see Ch. VI. § 3). The metrical ecthlipsis, which disregards the final -M when a vowel follows, may be explained by supposing a sort of *anusvârah* in the Latin language. In the transition to the Romance languages, which make a new nominative of the Latin accusative, the final *m* is dropt in all but two instances—the Italian *speme* = *spem*, which extends it by a final vowel, and the French *rien* = *rem*, which substitutes the nasal *auslaut.*

§ 3. *The Gutturals.*

The Roman gutturals are three,—the medial G, the aspirate H, and the labio-guttural tenuis Q. The regular changes of this order of mutes, as far as the Latin language is concerned, are proved by the following examples; the law itself, as applied to the gutturals, being expressed thus:

Latin, (Greek, Sanscrit) .	G	H	C
Gothic	K	G	H, G
Old High German . . .	CH	K	H, G

1st column. Initials: *granum*, O. N. *korn*, O. H. G. *chorn; genus, kuni, chunni; gena*, O. N. *kinn*, O. H. G. *chinni; genu, knê, chnio; gelu, gelidus*, Gothic *kalds*, O. H. G. *chalt; gustare, kiusan, chiosan.* Middle sounds; *ego, ik, ih* (*ich*); *ager, akrs,*

achar; magnus, mikils, michil; jugum, juk, joch; mulgere, O. N. *miólka,* O. H. G. *mëlchan.*

2d column. Initials: *hanser, gans, kans; heri, hesternus, gistra, këstar; hortus, gards, karto; hostis, gasts, kast; homo, guma, komo.* H is of rare occurrence as a middle sound in Latin; we may, however, compare *via, veha,* with *weg; veho* with Goth. *aigan; traho* with Anglo-Sax. *dragan,* &c.

3d column (in which I have substituted C for Q$_v$, because the latter belongs to a different class of comparisons). Initials: *claudus, halt, halz; caput, haubith, houbit; cor, haírto, hërza; canis, hunths, hund.* Middle sounds: *lux, liuhad, licht; tacere, thahan, dagen; decem,* Goth. *taíhun,* Lith. *deszimts.*

Originally the Romans made no distinction between the gutturals C and G; the former was the only sign used; and although Ausonius says (*Idyll.* XII. *de litteris,* v. 21): *gammæ vice functa prius* C (see also Festus, s. vv. *prodigia, orcum*), thereby implying that C expressed both the medial G and the tenuis K[1], there is reason to believe that in the older times the Romans pronounced C as a medial, and used Q as their only tenuis guttural. This appears from the forms *macestratus, leciones,* &c., on the Duillian monument, and still more strikingly from the fact that the prænomens *Gaius, Gnæus* (Γάϊος, Γενναῖος), were to the last indicated by the initials *C.* and *Cn.*; for in the case of a proper name the old character would survive the change of application. When, however, the Romans began to distinguish between the pure tenuis K and the labial tenuis Q, they introduced a distinction between C and G, which was marked by the addition of a tail to the old character C, the letter thus modified being used to represent the medial, and the old form being transferred from the medials to the tenues. The author of this change was Sp. Carvilius, a freedman and namesake of the celebrated Sp. Carvilius Ruga, who, in A. U. C. 523, B. C. 231, furnished the first example of a divorce. See Plutarch, *Quæst. Rom.* p. 277 D.: τὸ Κ πρὸς τὸ Γ συγγένειαν ἔχει παρ' αὐτοῖς [the Romans], ὀψὲ γὰρ ἐχρήσαντο τῷ γάμμα Καρβιλίου Σπορίου προσεξευρόντος. Id. p. 278 E.: ὀψὲ ἤρξαντο μισθοῦ διδάσκειν, καὶ πρῶτος ἀνέῳξε γραμματοδιδασκαλεῖον Σπόριος Καρβίλιος ἀπελεύθερος Καρβιλίου τοῦ πρώτου γαμετὴν ἐκβα-

[1] On this confusion in other languages see *New Crat.* § 100.

λόντος. From the position in the alphabet assigned to this new character,—namely, the seventh place, corresponding to that of the Greek Z,—there is reason to believe that the Roman C still retained the hard *g*-sound, while the new character represented the soft sibilant pronunciation of the English J and the Greek Z, which is also expressed by the modern Italian *gi*. It is clear that the Greek K was introduced long before the time of Carvilius, and therefore there could have been no need of an additional character except for the expression of an additional sound. And as K was used only in the syllable *ka*, the additional sound must have been that borne by C and G in modern Italian before the vowels E and I. Before O and U, as we shall see directly, Q was in its original place.

The Latin H was a strong guttural aspirate, corresponding in position and in power to the Greek χ. It is true that this character sometimes indicates a mere *spiritus asper;* and in this use it is either dropt or prefixed, according to the articulation. In general, however, it was the strongest and purest of the Roman aspirated gutturals. Graff has remarked (*Abhandl. Berl. Ak.* 1839, p. 12) that there are three classes of aspirates—the guttural (H), *i. e.* the *spiritus;* the labial (W) *i. e.* the *flatus;* and the dental (S), *i. e.* the *sibilatus:* and he says that the Latin language entirely wants the first, whereas it possesses the labial aspirate in its Q, and the dental perhaps in its X. This appears to me to be neither a clear nor a correct statement. With regard to H in particular, there can be no doubt that it is a strong guttural, quite as much so as the Greek χ. This is established by the following comparison. The Latin H answers to χ in the words *hiems* (χείμων), *hibernus* (χειμέρινος), *hio* (χαίνω), *humi* (χάμαι), *hortus* (χόρτος), &c. It represents the guttural C in *trah-o, trac-si, veh-o, vec-si,* &c. In a word, it corresponds to the hard Sanscrit *h*, for which, in the cognate Gothic and Greek words, either *g*, *k*, or γ, κ, χ, are substituted (comp. *N. Crat.* § 112). An initial H, or some other guttural, was often omitted in Latin, as in other languages, before another consonant; thus we have *res* for *hres=hra-is* from *hir* "the hand;" *rus* for *hrus* or *crus* (*karsh* = *aro*), *læna* by the side of χλαῖνα; *ruo* by the side of con-*gruo*, *Roma* by the side of *gruma* (above, p. 60), &c. And even before vowels we have frequent instances of the extenuation and omission of an original H. Indeed it is

sometimes a matter of doubt whether the H ought to be retained or dismissed in spelling; thus some would write *Hannibal*, others *Annibal;* some *Etruria*, others, more correctly as I think, but less in accordance with authority, *Hetruria;* although *aut* and *haud* are the same word, and though old MSS. make no distinction between them (Lachmann *ad Lucret.* III. 330, 632), the former generally omits, while the latter as generally retains the H; and while *hæreo* is almost the universally received orthography, we have *æsit* in Lucret. VI. 1016 (*ubi v. Lachm.*), in accordance with the Tyrrhenian *at-æsum*, (above, Ch. V. § 3. p. 153).

With regard to Q or Q_v, a character almost peculiar to the Latin alphabet, a longer investigation will be necessary. It has been a common opinion with philologers that there were different classes of the tenuis guttural, varying with the vowel which articulated them; thus, κάππα, *kaph*, was followed only by *a;* H (*heth*) only by *e;* χῖ only by *i;* κόππα, *koph*, only by *o;* and Q only by *u*. Lepsius (*Zwei Abhandl.* pp. 18-31) has given a more rational and systematic form to this opinion, by supposing that there were three fundamental vowels, *a, i, u;* that *i* was subsequently split up into *i, e*, and *u* into *o, u;* that one of the three fundamental vowels was prefixed to each row of mutes in the old organic syllabarium, so that all the medials were articulated with *a*, all the aspirates with *i*, and all the tenues with *u*. This form of the opinion, however, is by no means sufficient to explain the peculiarities of the Roman Q_v; and if it were, still it could not be adopted, as it runs counter to the results of a more scientific investigation into the origin of *i* and *u*.

The difficulty, which has been felt in dealing with the Latin Q, has proceeded chiefly from the supposition that the accompanying *u* or *v* must be either a distinct vowel or a distinct consonant; for if it is a vowel, then either it ought to form a diphthong with the accompanying vowel, or a distinct syllable with the Q; and neither of these cases ever happens: if, on the other hand, it is a consonant, the vowel preceding the Q ought to be long by position; and this is never the case even in the most ancient writers (see Graff, *Abh. Berl. Ak.* 1839: "über den Buchstaben Q (Q_v)").

It appears to me unnecessary to assume that the accompanying U is either a distinct vowel or a distinct consonant. And herein consists the peculiarity of the Roman Q: it cannot be

articulated without the *u*, and yet the *u* has no distinct existence. The true explanation, I conceive, is the following. No attentive student of the Latin authors can have failed to observe how great a tendency there is in this language to introduce sounds consisting of an union of the guttural and labial. Such a sound is the digamma, which may be considered to have been the leading characteristic of the Pelasgian language both in Italy and in Greece. Now there are four states of this sound, besides its original condition, in which both guttural and labial have their full power: the first is when the labial predominates, and this is expressed by the letter F = *sv* (*hv*); the second is when the guttural predominates, and this is expressed by Qv; the third is when the guttural alone is sounded, and in this state it becomes the strong guttural H or K; the fourth is when the labial alone is articulated, and from this we have the letter V.

The great difference between F and Qv consists in this, that in the latter it is necessary to express both the ingredients of the double sound, whereas they are both represented by one character in the former. Hence it has happened, that, while the guttural element of F has been overlooked by many philologers, they have over-estimated the independent value of the labial which accompanies Q.

A sound, bearing the same relation to the medials that Qv does to the tenues, is occasionally formed by the addition of *v* to G. This occurs only after *n* and *r*: thus we find *tinguo, unguo, urgueo,* by the side of *tingo, ungo, urgeo.* The former were probably the original words, the latter being subsequent modifications: compare *guerra,* "war," *guardire,* "ward," &c. with the French pronunciation of *guerre, guardir,* &c. (*New Crat.* § 110).

When the labial ingredient of Qv is actually vocalised into *u*, the Q is expressed in classical Latin by the new tenuis C = K; thus *quojus, quoi,* the original gen. and dat. of *qui,* become *cujus, cui; cui rei* becomes *cur; quom* is turned into *cum; sequundus, oquulus, torquular* (comp. *torqueo*), *quiris* (cf. *Quirinus*), &c., are converted into *secundus, oculus, torcular, curis,* &c. This is also the case when *u* is represented by the similar Roman sound of the *o*. Thus *colo* must have been originally *quolo;* for Q is the initial of *quolonia* on coins, and *in-quilinus* is obviously derived from *in-colo,* which has lost its *u,* just as

quotidie is written *cotidie* (Schneider, *Lat. Gr.* I. p. 335). It is known, too, that *coquus* must have been pronounced *quoquus* even in Cicero's time; for he made no difference in pronunciation between the particle *quoque* and the vocative of *coquus:* see Quintil. VI. 3, § 47: "Quæ Ciceroni aliquando.... exciderunt, ut dixit, quum is candidatus, qui coqui filius habebatur, coram eo suffragium ab alio peteret: ego *quoque* tibi favebo." The change of *qva* into *cu* is particularly remarkable when a syllable is shortened, on account of the heavier form in which it occurs; as when *quatio* in composition becomes *con-cutio, per-cutio,* &c. Perhaps we ought to write *acüa* in those cases in which *aqua* appears as a trisyllable (Lachmann *ad Lucret.* VI. 552).

The two constituent parts of Qv often exist separately in different forms of the same root: thus we have *conniveo, connixi; fio* (φύω), *facio, factus; fluo, fluxi; foveo, focus; juvo, jucundus; lavo, lacus; nix, nivis; struo, struxi; vivo, vixi.* The last is a double instance; for there can be no doubt of the connexion between "quick" and *vivus* (for *qviqvus*) (*New Crat.* § 112, note). Bopp's opinion, therefore (*Vergleich. Gramm.* pp. 18, 98), that there is some natural connexion between *v* and *k* in themselves, is altogether unfounded.

In the comparison between Latin and Sanscrit we seldom find that Qv is represented by a Sanscrit K, but that it usually stands in cognate words where the Sanscrit has a *palatal* guttural or sibilant (*New Crat.* §§ 105, 216): compare *quatuor,* Sanscr. *chatur; s-quama,* Sanscr. *chad,* "tegere;" *quumulus,* Sanscr. *chi,* "accumulare;" *oc-cultus* (*ob-quultus*), Sanscr. *jal,* "tegere;" *sequor,* Sanscr. *sajj; pequus,* Sanscr. *paçu; equus,* Sanscr. *açva;* &c. When Qv stands by the side of a Sanscrit *k,* it is either when that letter is followed by *e* or *i*—in which case the guttural approximates to the palatal,—or when the *k* stands before *u* or *v.* There are some instances in which the Qv is represented by the labial P in Greek and Sanscrit; and this is particularly remarkable in cases where the Qv occurs twice in the Latin word: compare the Latin *quinque, quoquo* (*coquo*), *aqua, loquor,* &c., with the Sanscrit and Greek *panchan, πέμπε, pach, πέπω, âp, lap,* &c.; also *equus, oquulus, sequor, linquo,* &c., with ἵππος, ὄμμα, ἕπομαι, λείπω, &c.

Quintilian says that the Latin Q is derived from the Greek κόππα (I. 4, § 9); and there can be no doubt that they have a

common origin. Now this Greek *κόππα*, which is of rare occurrence, is found, where it occurs in Greek inscriptions, only before *ο*. Thus we have *ϙοριν θοθεν* (Böckh, *C. I.* no. 29), *ὀϙον* (n. 37), *λυϙοδορκας* (n. 166); and on coins we have *ϙορινθος*, *Συραϙοσιων*, &c. The explanation of this is simple: the letter *ο* before a vowel expressed the sound of *w*, so far as the mouth of a Greek could convey this sound: compare *οἶστρος*, *ῥοῖβδος*, which imitate the *whizzing* noises of the wings of the gad-fly and the bird; *ὄα*, which represents the Persian lamentation *wa!* &c. (above, p. 49). Consequently, the syllable *ϙο* must be regarded as the residuum of a syllable pronounced *kwa*, which was probably the pronunciation of the Latin Qv. At any rate, it is sufficiently evident from the single word *λυϙοδορκας* that *ϙ* and *κ* could not have been identical at the time when the inscription was carved; otherwise we should have had either *λυκοδορκας* or *λυϙοδορϙας*. In fact, the word *λυκος* must have been originally *λυϙοος* (*luqvus*), otherwise the labial in the Latin *lupus* would be inexplicable. Perhaps, too, as Graff suggests (u. s. p. 10, note 7), there are other Greek words containing the syllable *κο* or *κυ*, which must have been written with *ϙ* in the older state of the language. He selects the following, of which the Sanscrit equivalents have the palatals *ç*, *ch*: *κόσμος*, *κόγχος*, *κόρση*, *κῶνος*, *κυανός*, Sanscrit *çudh*, "purificari;" *çankha*, "concha;" *çirsha*, "caput;" *çó*, "acuere," Lat. *qvurvus*; *chyâma*, "violaceus." The passage from Qv into *ϙο*, *κυ*, &c. may be illustrated also by the converse change from *κυ* to *qu* in "liquorice," from *γλυκυῤῥίζα*, &c., while the English articulation of "can" has entirely obliterated all traces of the Q in the Latin *queo*, originally *queno* (cf. *ne-quinont* for *ne-queunt*), though the German *können* still preserves this sound by implication.

If we examine the changes which have taken place in the gutturals in their passage from the Roman to the Romance languages, we are first struck by the general tendency to soften down or assibilate the tenuis C. The former process is effected by a change of C into CH: compare the Latin *caballus*, *cadere*, *calidus*, *camera*, *canis*, *caput*, *carmen*, *carus*, *casa*, *castanea*, *castus*, *caulis*, &c., with the French *cheval*, *cheoir*, *chaud*, *chambre*, *chien*, *chef*, *charme*, *cher*, *chez*, *châtaigne*, *chaste*, *choux*, &c. Of the assibilation of C we have many instances: such are, *facimus*, Fr. *faisons*; *licere*, *loisir*; *placere*, *plaisir*, &c.

Scaliger says (*prima Scaligerana*, p. 114): "mutam *semper* Galli tollunt inter duas vocales." This is very often justified by the transition from Latin to French in the case of gutturals and dentals. Between two vowels C is sometimes dropt; thus the *Icauna* becomes the *Yonne*, *Tricasses* becomes *Troyes;* and similarly the *Sequana* is turned into the *Seine.*

Another change in the Romance languages is the omission of C when it is followed by a T: comp. *dictus*, It. *ditto*, Fr. *dit; pectus*, It. *petto*, Fr. *poitrine*, &c. C also disappears in French when in the Latin form it was followed by R. Compare *lacrima, sacramentum*, &c., with *larme, serment*, &c. It is neglected in the same language when it stands between two vowels, especially when one or both are *u* (*o*) or *i:* compare *apicula, corbicula, focus, jocus, locus, nocere, paucus, vices*, &c., with *abeille, corbeille, feu, jeu, lieu, nuire, peu, fois*, &c. An omission of the hard *c* is sometimes strangely compensated by the introduction of *o* before *i*; thus we have *poix* from *pix*, *Poitiers* from *Pictones*, &c. We must distinguish this from *foyer* by the side of *focus* which has an O already.

In some cases the French converts the tenuis C into the medial G. Compare *aigre, aveugle, maigre*, &c. with *acer, aboculus, macer*, &c.

G is often omitted in the middle of French words: compare *Augustus, Augustodunum, Brigantio, Lugdunum, legere, Ligeris, mais, maistre, noir, paien, reine*, &c., with *Août, Autun, Briançon, Lyon, lire, Loire, magis, magister, niger, paganus, regina*, &c. Similarly, we have *dais* or *dois* (*dasium*) from *dagus* = *dach*, i. e. the canopy over the high table in the hall. Compare also our pronunciation of *Augustin* as *Austin*, and of *Magdalen* as *Maudlin.* The same omission took place in old Latin; thus we find *ma-vis* = *magis-vis.*

The French and Italians generally neglect the guttural H. The old hard sound of this aspirate is quite unknown to them.

Although the sibilant is in some cases akin to the dental class, the Latin sibilants X and S must be considered as belonging altogether to the gutturals. The Romans had a dental sibilant in their R, of which I shall speak directly; but these two seem to have in themselves no connexion with the dentals, beyond the circumstance that R is frequently derived from S by the substitution of a dental articulation, in the same way as θ stands for σ

in *θάλασσα* for *σάλασσα*, &c., and as the lisping Englishman says *yeth* for *yes*.

If we consider x in its common acceptation, it is a direct combination of the guttural c or g with the sibilant s. This must, of course, be its power in *rexi*, *flexi*, &c. But it was not always equivalent to this combination either in sound or in origin. Sometimes it stands for the dental ζ = *dj*, as in *rixa* compared with ἔριδ-ς, ἐρίζω, &c. And even when it was derived immediately from a guttural and s, the sibilant seems to have overpowered the guttural, which was either lost altogether or pronounced only as an aspiration. We have traces of this in the modern Italian pronunciation of *Alessandro*, *vissi*, &c. The Greek ξῖ derived its name from the Hebrew *shin*, and perhaps occasionally represented it in sound. A sibilant or aspirate often changes its place: thus the Gothic *hv* is in English *wh*, the Greek *hr* is the Latin *rh*, and the Greek ξ = κσ- might occasionally be σκ-: compare the transposition in the oriental words *Iscander*, *Scanderoon*, *Candahar*, all derived from the Greek Ἀλέ-ξανδρος. The last of these words is a mutilation which reminds us of the modern Scotch division of the name *Alexander* into the two abbreviations *Alick* and *Saunders* or *Sandy*. When the transposition was once effected, the softening of the guttural was obvious and easy: compare *σχέτλιος*, "scathe," *schade;* *χάρμη*, "s-kirmish," *schirm*, &c.

The Latin s is principally remarkable as standing at the beginning of words, the Greek equivalents of which have only an aspirate: compare *sal*, *sex*, *septem*, *sol*, *sylva*, *simul*, *sedere*, *sequi*, *somnus*, &c., with ἅλς, ἕξ, ἑπτα, ἥλιος, ὕλFη, ἅμα, ἕζεσθαι, ἕπομαι, ὕπνος, &c. Though in some cases even this aspirate has vanished: as in ἄναξ, εἰ, ἑλλός, &c., compared with *senex*, *si*, *sileo*, &c. It frequently happens that in the more modern forms of the Roman language an original s has been superseded by the dental sibilant r. Thus Quintilian tells us (I. 4, § 13) that *Valesius*, *Fusius*, *arbos*, *labos*, *vapos*, *clamos*, and *lases* (cf. Fest. s. v.), were the original forms of *Valerius*, *Furius*, *arbor*, *labor*, *vapor*, *clamor*, and *lares;* and it is clear that *honor*, *honestus*, are only different forms of *onus*, *onustus*. It is rather surprising that the Jurist Pomponius (*Digg.* I. 2, 2, § 36) should have attributed to Appius Claudius Cæcus (consul I. A.U.C. 447, B.C. 307; consul II. A.U.C. 458, B.C. 296) the inven-

tion of a letter which is the initial of the names *Roma* and *Romulus*. He can only mean that Appius was the first to introduce the practice of substituting R for S in proper names, a change which he might have made in his censorship. It appears, from what Cicero says, that L. Papirius Crassus, who was consul in A.U.C. 418, B.C. 336, was the first of his name who did not call himself *Papisius* (*ad Famil.* IX. 21): "How came you to suppose," says Cicero, writing to L. Papirius Pætus, "that there never was a Papirius of patrician rank, when it is certain that they were *patricii minorum gentium?* To begin with the first of these, I will instance L. Papirius Mugillanus, who, in the year of the city 312, was censor with L. Sempronius Atratinus, who had previously (A.U.C. 310) been his colleague in the consulship. But your family-name at that time was *Papisius*. After him there were thirteen of your ancestors who were curule magistrates before L. Papirius Crassus, the first of your family that disused the name *Papisius*. This Papirius was chosen *dictator* in A.U.C. 415, with L. Papirius Cursor for his *magister equitum*, and four years afterwards he was elected consul with K. Duilius." We must conclude, therefore, that Appius Claudius used his censorial authority to sanction a practice, which had already come into vogue, and which was intimately connected with the peculiarities of the Roman articulation. In fact, the Romans were to the last remarkable for the same tendency to rhotacism, which is characteristic of the Umbrian, Dorian, and Old Norse dialects.

§ 4. *The Dentals.*

The Romans had five dentals or linguals: the mutes D and T, the liquids L and N, and the secondary letter R, which in most alphabets is considered a liquid, but in the Latin stands for an aspiration or assibilation of the medial D. Grimm's law, as applied to the dentals, stands thus:

Latin, (Greek, Sanscrit) .	D		T
Gothic	T	D	Z, TH
Old High German . .	Z	T	D

The following examples will serve to establish the rule.

1st column. Initials: *dingua, lingua, tuggo, zunga; deus,* O. N. *týr,* O. H. G. *ziu; dens, dentis,* Goth. *tunthus,* O. H. G. *zand; domare, tamjan, zemen; dolus,* O. N. *tâl, zâla; ducere,*

Goth. *tiuhan*, O. H. G. *ziohan ; duo, tva, zuei ; dextra, taíhsvô, zësawa.* Midlde sounds : *sedes, sedere, sitan, sizan ; edere, itan, ëzan ; videre, vitan, wizan ; odium, hatis, haz ; u-n-da, vatô, wazar ; sudor, sveiti, sweiz ; pedes, fôtjus, vuozi.*

2d column. The Latin has no θ; and when the R stands for the D, there are generally other coexistent forms in which the medial is found. For the purpose of comparison Grimm has selected some Latin words in which a Latin F stands by the side of the Greek θ. Initials : *fores* (*θύρα*), *daúr, tor ; fera* (*θήρ*), O. N. *dŷr*, O. H. G. *tior.* Middle sounds : *audere, ausus* (*θαῤῥεῖν*), *gadaúran, turran ; mathu,* Tusc. (Gr. *μέθυ*), Anglo-Sax. *mëdo,* O. H. G. *mëtu.*

3d column. Initials : *tu,* Gothic *thu ;* O. H. G. *dû ; tener,* O. N. *thunnr,* O. H. G. *dunni ; tendere,* Goth. *thanjan,* O. H. G. *denen ; tacere, thahan, dagen ; tolerare, thulan, dolen ; tectum, thak, dach.* Middle sounds : *frater, brôthar, pruoder ; rota,* O. N. *hradhr* (" celer"), O. H. G. *hrad* (" rota") ; *a-l-ter* (Umbr. Tusc. *etre*), *anthar, andar ; iterum, vithra, widar.*

Of the commutations of the dentals one with another in the Latin language alone, the most constant is the interchange of D with L or R. D becomes L in *delicare* (Fest. pp. 70, 73), *impelimenta, levir, Melica,* (Fest. p. 124), *olfacit,* for *dedicare, impedimenta, δαήρ, Medica, odefacit ;* and is assimilated to L in such words as *mala, ralla, scala, sella,* from *ma-n-do, rado, sca-n-do, sedeo :* the converse change is observable in *Ὀδυσσεύς, Πολυδεύκης, δάκρυον* (*dacrima,* Fest. p. 68), *δαψιλής, dingua* (Mar. Vict. p. 2547) (O. H. G. *zunga*), *Capitodium, meditari, kadamitas, adauda,* &c., the more genuine forms of which are preserved in *Ulysses* (*ὀλίγος*), *Pol-lux* (comp. *δευκές*, Hesych. with *lux*), *lacryma* (*liqueo*), *lapsilis* (*λάπτω*), *lingua* (*λείχειν*), *Capitolium, μελετᾶν, calamitas, alauda,* &c. : *δέω,* on the contrary, is a more ancient form than *ligare,* (see *N. Crat.* § 155). This change takes place within the limits of the Greek language also : comp. *δείδω* with *δειλός, δᾷς* (*δᾴδος*) with *δαλός,* &c., though in many of these cases there is the residue of an original assimilation, as in *καλός,* root *καδ-,* cf. *κάζω,* &c. The change is also observable in the passage from Latin to the Romance languages ; thus *Digentia* has become *Licenza,* the people of *Madrid* call themselves *Madrilenos,* and *Egidius* becomes *Giles.* The other dentals, T and N, are also sometimes converted into L : as

in *Thetis, Thelis; Nympha, Lympha,* &c. (See Varro, *L. L.* VII. § 87). In some cases there is a passage from δ to λ in Greek, as in *ἄδην, ἅλις* (compare *satis*); and the Greek θ in *θώρηξ* is represented by an *l* in *lorica.* There is an interchange of N and R in *œreus, œneus;* in *murus, munio;* in *δῶρον, donum; πλήρης, plenus; Londres, London; Havre, Hafen;* &c. The ablative or adverbial D has become *n* in *longinquus, propinquus,* from *longe*[*d*], *prope*[*d*]; compare *antiquus, posticus,* from *antea, postea, amicus* from *amo* (*amao*), &c. In the corruption *Catamitus* from *Ganymedes,* both N and D are changed into T, and in *caduceus* from *κηρύκειον* we have the converse change from R to D. D is dropt when flanked by two vowels, as *es* for *edis, est* for *edit, esse* for *edere, item* for *ititidem,* &c. So also the dental liquids L and N are liable to excision; compare *vis* = *volis,* and the numberless omissions of the final *-nt* as in *fuêre* = *fuerunt, regna* = *regnont.*

The change from D to R has been often pointed out, in such common instances as *au-ris* compared with *aud-io, apor* for *apud, meridie* for *medii die, ar-vocat* for *ad-vocat,* &c. The verb *arcesso,* which is also written *accerso,* furnishes a double example of the change: the original form was *ad-ced-so* = *accedere sino;* in *arcesso* the first *d* is changed into *r,* and the second assimilated to *s:* in *accerso* the first *d* is assimilated to *c,* and the second changed to *r.* In the Romance language D is changed into R in the Spanish *lampare* from *lampada,* and conversely in the Italian *rado* from *raro, fedire* from *ferire;* compare the English *paddock* for *parruc,* A. S. for *park.*

As a final letter, D became more and more liable to proscription. With the exception of the proclitics *ad* and *apud,* sometimes written *et* or *at* and *aput, ar* and *apor;* the conjunction *sed,* also written *set;* and the adverb *haud,* also written *haut* and *aut* (cf. *autem*); we have no D in *auslaut* in classical Latinity. In the ablative, D was absorbed before the rise of Roman literature, and *-ad* for *-nd* or *-nt* in the neuter plural was finally represented by *-ă* only.

N is principally remarkable in Latin from its use as a sort of *anusvârah* (see *N. Crat.* p. 303). In this use it is inserted, generally before the second consonant of the root, as in *tu-n-do,* root *tud-; fi-n-do,* root *fid-,* &c.; but sometimes after it, as in *ster-n-o,* root *ster-, stra-; sper-n-o,* root *sper-, spre-; si-n-o,* root *si-,* &c.

Conversely, N becomes evanescent in certain cases, particularly before S and V. Thus *consul* is written *cosol* (abbreviated into *cos*); and we find *cesor, infas, vicies, vicesimus,* for *censor, infans, viciens, vicensumus.* This omission of N is regular in the Greek participles in -εις, and in other words, *e. g.* ὀδούς; it seems also to have been the rule in Umbrian. In the Romance language the Latin termination *-ensis* generally loses its N. Thus we have *Vaudois* by the side of *Waldenses, bourgeois* for *burgensis, courtois* for *cortensis,* &c. In Italian we have *Veronese* for *Veronensis, marchese* for *marchensis, paese* for *pagensis;* and the two last pass into the French *marquis* and *pays.* The most important instance of the omission of N before V is furnished by the common word *contio,* derived from *conventio* through the form *coventio*[1], which is found in old inscriptions. Similarly, *convent* becomes *covent* ("*Covent*-garden, &c."), *Confluentes* is turned into *Coblenz,* and *fünf* into "five." In English the prefix *con* is shortened into *co-* before all consonants, in spite of the remonstrances of Bentley. On the contractions of *con* in Latin, see Lachmann on Lucret. II. 1061. The original preposition is especially disguised in *cœlebs = co-i-lebs = coitum linquens.*

With regard to the changes experienced by the dentals in the passage from Latin to the Romance dialects, the following instances may suffice. D and T are frequently dropt in the French forms of Latin words: (a) D: *Andegavi,* Fr. *Anjou; Cadurci,* Fr. *Cahors; Mediomatrices,* Fr. *Metz; Meduana,* Fr. *Mayenne; Mediolanum,* It. *Milano; Melodunum,* Fr. *Melun; cauda* (It. *coda,* Sp. *cola*), Fr. *queue; fides,* Fr. *foi; media-nocte,* Fr. *mi-nuit; nudus,* Fr. *nu; Rhodanus,* Fr. *Rhone; vadum,* Fr. *gué; videre,* Fr. *voir*[2]. (b) T: *acetum,* Lomb. *aseo; ad-satis,* Fr. *as-sez* (originally *assetz*); *Autura,* Fr. *Eure; amatus,* Fr. *aimé; Bituriges,* Fr. *Bourges; Matisco,* Fr. *Mâçon; Rhedones,* Fr. *Rennes; Rodumna,* Fr. *Rouanne; Catalauni,* Fr.

---

[1] *Contio* stands related to *coventio* as *nuntius* to *novi-ven-tius;* comp. *nov-i-tius. Domitius,* the proper name, seems to signify "the home-goer;" so *propitius,* as the antecedent of *praesens,* when said of a deity. *Ilithyia* (old fem. of εἰλειθώς) might be rendered *Propitia.*

[2] The French sometimes drop the D before a guttural in words of German extraction, as in *Huguenot* for *Eidgenossen,* or *Eid-genoten,* i. e. "conspirators."

Châlons; pater, Fr. *père; Rutheni*, Fr. *Rodez; vita*, Fr. *vie.* There is a double abbreviation in *Arras* from *Atrebates.* So also we have, *Mayence* from *Moguntiacum, page* from *paedagogium* (*N. Crat.* § 225), and *Rich-borough* from *Rutupium,* where we have also the change from *pi* to *ch* (above, p. 244). In *Grenoble* from *Gratianopolis* the first three syllables are contracted, just as in *grè* from *gratia,* in *malgré*, &c. On the contrary, D intrudes or is revived in certain prepositions when compounded with verbs beginning with a vowel; thus we have *prodest* but *prō-sunt, red-eo,* but *re-verto,* and as we have *re-fero,* it may be doubtful whether *rē-tuli* or *ret-tuli* is for *red-tuli* or *re-tetuli. Relligio, relliquiæ*, &c. favour the former supposition. In the Romance languages this letter is sometimes inserted as a fulcrum between the liquids *n* and *r*, as in *cendre, Dordogne, gendre, tendre,* from *ciner-is, Duranius, gener, tener; viendr-ai, tiendr-ai,* for *venir-ai* (*venire habeo*), *tener-ai* (*tenere habeo*), &c.; *vendredi* for *Veneris-die*, &c. This will remind the classical student of the similar insertion in the Greek *ἀν-δ-ρός*, &c.; and both the Greeks and the Romans apply the same principle to the labials also. The combination TI is almost always represented by a soft G in French words derived from the Latin; as *age, étage, mariage* from *ætatium, statio, maritatio.* In these cases it is matter of indifference whether we suppose a softening of the whole combination (*N. Crat.* § 112) or an omission of the dental and substitution of the $i = j$, as in the labial forms mentioned above (p. 244).

The indistinctness with which the French pronounce N at the end of a word has given rise to some etymological, or rather orthographical, inconsistencies in that language. Not the least remarkable of these is the appearance of S instead of M or N in the first person of many verb-forms. If we compare *suis* with the Italian *sono* on the one hand, and the Spanish *soy* on the other, and remember that the first and third persons of the present tense in the Romance verbs do not exhibit a final S in the oldest examples of the language, we may conclude that the S in this and other French forms is an arbitrary orthographic appendage. The termination *-ois=ensis* shows that *soy* is not an inadequate representative of *sono.*

L, N, R, are frequently interchanged as the Latin passes into

the Romance idiom. L passes into R[1] in *apôtre, epître, Orne, rossignol, titre,* &c., from *apostolus, epistola, Olina, lusciniola, titulus,* &c.;—N into L in *alma, Barcelona, Bologna, Lebrixa,* from *anima, Barcino, Bononia, Nebrissa;*—N into R in *diacre* from *diaconus,* in *sero, sevi* by the side of *sino, sivi,* and in *Langres* from *Lingones, Never* from *Noviodunum.* In Old Latin *r* passes into *l,* as in *Cæles Vivenna* from *Cæres* (above, p. 26); but *l* passes into *r* in *cæruleus* from *cæluleus.* We seem to have a change of *l* into *r,* or *vice versa,* in *lis, litis,* from *stlit,* compared with the German *streit.*

L is a representation of D in *Giles* from *Ægidius,* in *ellera* for *edera,* and in *Versiglia* for *Vesidia.*

The Italians vocalise L into I when it follows certain consonants: compare *clamare, clarus, clavis, flos, Florentia, fluctus, flumen, obliquus, Placentia, planus, plenus,* &c., with *chiamare, chiaro, chiave, fiore, Fiorenze* (*Firenze*), *fiotto, fiume, bieco* (Fr. *biais,* Engl. "bias[2]"), *Piacenza, piano, pieno,* &c.

The French vocalise the Latin L into U, which seems to have been in the first instance only an affection of the previous vowel, into which the L was subsequently absorbed. Thus *alter* was first written *aultre,* and then *autre.* This affection of a preceding vowel by the liquid which follows is not uncommon in other languages. The Greeks in some of their dialects pronounced the vowel broad before or after ρ: comp. φρασί with φρεσί, &c.: and the common people in Dorsetshire pronounce *o* like *a* when it is followed by *r* and another consonant; thus *George* is pronounced *Gearge, storm, starm,* &c. The French absorption of the L is almost universal: it is regular in the dative of the article *au=a le, aux=à les;* in the plurals of nouns in *l,* as *animales, animaux; canales, canaux,* &c. But it is also found in a number of other words, in which the vowel

---

[1] *Ad-ûlare* seems to be an instance of the converse change from R to L: for this compound is from *ad* and *ula* = οὐρά, and refers, like the Greek σαίνειν (= σείειν, "to shake or wag"), to the dog blandishing, fawning, and wagging his tail. The older etymologers connect it with *ad-oro;* but this admits of a different interpretation.

[2] It is probable that the word "bias" came from France with the game of bowls, and as denoting that one-sided weight which makes the sphere run obliquely, it is connected in meaning as well as origin with *biais = bieco = obieco = obliquus.*

preceding *l* is not *a;* even when it is *u:* compare *aliquis unus, altare,* ἐλεημοσύνη, *Bulgare, felix* (like ὁ μακαρίτης, used in speaking of the dead), *ulna,* &c., with the French *aucun, autel, aumône, bougre, feu* (anciently written *feux* and *feulx*), *aune,* &c.

§ 5. *The Vowels.*

The philological student must always bear in mind that there are two distinct classes of vowels; the one containing the vowels of articulation, A, E, O; the other comprising the vocalised consonants I and U. In other words, there are only three distinct vowels, A, I, U; for E and O differ from A in weight only.

The original alphabet is a syllabarium consisting of breathings and consonants, which are articulated by the sound A. Now the character A, in its original application, denotes the lightest of the breathings, the character E the heaviest of them, and the character O a breathing which is intermediate in weight. Consequently, on the principle that the lightest vowel always co-exists with the heaviest form (see *N. Crat.* §§ 101, 222, &c.), when these breathings were no longer indicated by distinct characters, A would represent the heaviest articulation-vowel, E the lightest, and O that which stands between them in point of weight. That this is actually the order of the articulation-vowels, considered in respect to the weight of the combinations in which they are found, is clearly established by an examination of the existing forms in the most perfect of the Indo-Germanic languages.

The vowels I and U result from the vocalisation, not of breathings,—as is the case with A, E, O,—but of mutes. The former is the ultimate state of the softened or assibilated gutturals and dentals, the latter is the residuum of the labials (*N. Crat.* § 108). But, though they are of different origin from A and its subordinates, they must be considered, especially in the Latin language, as occasionally approximating in sound to the vowels derived from breathings, and as representing them in certain cases, where forms of an intermediate weight require an intermediate weight of vowels. This will be best shown by examples, from which it will appear that the vowels I and U have shades of value, or rather that they admit of subdivision into other vowels, differing from them in weight, as E and O differ from A, but not expressed in different characters, at least in the existing written remains of the Latin language.

It has been remarked that the *a* of the root-syllable is changed into *i* or *e* in secondary formations according to a fixed rule: namely, the *a* becomes *i* when the root-syllable in the longer form remains otherwise unchanged; but the *a* is turned into *e* when the root-syllable is followed immediately by an adscititious consonant, or when the consonant following the root-vowel is thrown back upon the vowel by some consonantal vowel, like *i*, or *e=y* (see Bopp, *Vergleich. Gramm.* p. 5; Rosen, *Journal of Education*, VIII. p. 344; *N. Crat.* § 222[1]). The following examples may suffice to establish this:

A	I	E
amicus	*in-imicus*	"enmity."
arma		*in-ermis.*
ars		*in-ers.*
barba		*im-berbis.*
caput	*oc-ciput*	*bi-ceps.*
	prin-cipium	*præ-ceps.*
	sin-ciput	*prin-ceps.*
cado	*ce-cidi.*	
	stilli-cidium.	
cano	*ce-cini*	*con-centus.*
	tubi-cinis	*tubi-cen.*
facio	*con-ficio*	*con-fectus.*
	pro-ficiscor	*pro-fectus.*
factum		*pro-fecto.*
fallo		*fe-felli.*
fastus		*pro-festus.*
gradior		*re-gredior.*
jacio	*ab-jicio*	*ab-jectus.*
taceo	*con-ticesco.*	
tango	*con-tingo.*	

The cause of the change from I to E is farther shown by the change back again from E to I when the root is not followed by two consonants: thus, *bi-ceps*, &c., become *bi-cipitis*, &c. in the genitive; and similarly *tubi-cen*[*s*] makes *tubi-cinis*. Another change from I to E is to be remarked in the transformation of

[1] Similar to this is the case of *qametz ᶜhatuph* in Hebrew, for here the long *ā* becomes *ŏ* in consequence of the consonant in *auslaut* being thrown back on the vowel of articulation.

the diphthongs AI, OI into AE and OE. It was also a peculiarity of the Latin writers from the earliest times to use E as a representative of EI, for which also they occasionally substituted I. Thus, while Ἤπειρος becomes *Epirus; Dei, Di; Deis, Dis;* &c.; we have *naves* by the side of *naveis=navis*, and both *tris* and *tres* by the side of *treis*. Schwartze (*alte Ægypten*, I. p. 605) distinguishes three main periods of Latin orthography in regard to the pronunciation of I and E. The peculiarity of the first and oldest period consisted in the employment of E with a dull I sound, which Schwartze terms the E *pinguis*. The second period, which immediately preceded the classical, wrote I instead of this E *pinguis*. The third or classical period in a considerable number of forms introduced an E, which *formally* corresponded to the old E *pinguis*, but was *materially* different from it, and this, as it possessed the true sound of E, he calls the phonetic E.

The next comparison, in point of weight, which suggests itself, is that between the secondary vowels I and U; and in order to make this comparison satisfactorily, it will be well to consider first their subdivisions. It appears, then, that there are three distinct uses of each of these vowels: I is (1) a very long vowel, the representative of the diphthong AI=AE; (2) a vowel of medium length, frequently, as we have seen above, the representative of *a*, the first part of that diphthong; (3) a very short vowel approximating to the sound of the shortest U, and used chiefly before R. Similarly, U is (1) a very long vowel, the representative of the diphthong OI=OE; (2) a vowel of medium length, generally answering to O, the first part of that diphthong; (3) a very short vowel, approximating to the sound of the shortest I, and used chiefly before L. The old Italians had separate characters for I_3 and U_3, which differed from the other characters by the addition of certain marks: I_3 was written F, like a mutilated F, and U_3 was written Ⱶ. It is remarkable that the emperor Claudius, when he introduced his new letters into the Roman alphabet to express the consonant V, the Greek Ψ, and the modification I_3, while he inverted the digamma (thus Ⅎ) to express the first, and joined two sigmas (thus Ↄ) to express the second, which was consequently called *antisigma* (Priscian, p. 545, Putsch; I. p. 40, Krehl), was contented to borrow the third from the old alphabet of the Oscans.

The following examples will justify the subdivision which I have made of the vowels I and U.

I$_1$.—In composition we find this long vowel in the root-syllable of words which contain the diphthong *ai* = *ae*. Thus, from *æs-timo* we have *ex-istimo;* from *æquus* we have *in-iquus;* from *cædo, con-cido, oc-cido;* from *quæro, in-quiro;* &c. This long I, as we have seen, also represents the diphthong EI, and it is used as a contraction for II, especially in the genitives of nouns in *-ius*. When employed for either of these purposes, it is expressed in the inscriptions by an exaggeration of form; thus we have DIS, ALI, OBIT, for *Deis, alii, obiit*. Conversely, we sometimes find that a doubled vowel is written to represent one long vowel; thus we have (Orelli, no. 1287): LEEGEALBAANA for *lege Albana*.

I$_2$.—This is the commonest power of the Roman I. It is, however, a representative of A in other cases besides those given above: thus, *inter* stands for the old *antar*, *ille* represents the Sanscrit *anya*, old Latin *ollus*, &c. From the examples quoted by Schwartze, *das alte Ægypten*, I. pp. 543, sqq., there need be no doubt that the older Romans used E as a representative of I$_2$.

I$_3$.—The sound of this letter is indicated by a passage in Velius Longus (p. 2235, Putsch): "Unde fit, ut sæpe aliud scribamus, aliud enuntiemus, sicut supra (p. 2219) locutus sum de *viro* et *virtute*, ubi I scribitur et pæne V enuntiatur; unde Ti. Claudius novam quandam litteram excogitavit, similem ei notæ, quam pro aspiratione Græci ponunt, per quam scriberentur eæ voces, quæ neque secundum exilitatem litteræ I, neque secundum pinguitudinem litteræ V sonant, ut in *viro* et *virtute*, neque rursus secundum latum litteræ sonum enuntiarentur, ut in eo quod est *legere, scribere*." From this passage we learn that I before R was pronounced somewhat like U, as is the case with us; and we also draw the important inference that *legere* and *scribere* must have been pronounced *lire* and *scrire*. In *augur* and the proper name *Spurius* this pronunciation seems to be expressed by the vowel U. The latter is a derivative from *super*, and is equivalent in meaning to *Superbus* (above, p. 26); the former is a derivative from *avi-gero*, as may be proved by a curious analogy between the derivatives of *avis*, "a bird," and *æ-s*, "a weight or burden." For as *ædi-ti-mus* means a person who is conversant with a temple (Fest. p. 13 = *ædis intimus*), so *avitimus* would mean "conversant with birds," *æs-timus*,

"conversant with weights;" hence, as augury and weighing were the two most usual means of forming a judgment, both *au-tumo* and *æs-tumo* signified "to judge." Comp. the use of *con-templor, con-sidero.* Again, as *æ-ger* signifies "bearing a burden," or "burdened," and *ne-ger*, "not able to bear," or "weak" (Fest. p. 165, s. v. *ne-gritu*[*do*]), so *augur* would mean "bearing a bird," or "dealing with birds" (*belli-ger*, &c.): comp. *au-spex*, &c. On the proper orthography of *Virgilius* or *Vergilius* the student will find the principal authorities in Wagner's *Virgil*, Vol. V. p. 479.

The existence of such a short vowel as I_3 is necessary for the explanation of those forms in which I appears to be lighter than E. Thus, from *lego, rego, teneo*, we have *col-ligo, di-rigo, re-tineo;* and the I thus introduced is so short, that it is omitted altogether in some compounds of *rego*, as *per*[*r*]*-go, sur*[*r*]*-go.* In the rustic pronunciation of the Italians I was frequently dropped (as in *ame*, from *animus*), and the E, on the other hand, was lengthened improperly; see Cic. *de Orat.* III. 12, § 46: "Quare Cotta noster, cujus tu illa lata, Sulpici, nonnumquam imitaris, ut *iota* litteram tollas, et E plenissimum dicas, non mihi oratores antiquos, sed messores videtur imitari."

U_1.—The interchange of the diphthong *oi* = *oe* with this value of U is of constant occurrence. Thus we have *oinos, unus; mœnus, munus;* &c.; and in Bœotian Greek ἔμυ for ἐμοί (Apollon. *de Pronom.* p. 364). The observation of some of these changes leads to interesting etymologies; as, for instance, in the case of the word *prœlium*, formerly written *proilium* (see Muretus, *Var. Lect.* VI. 4). The Greeks, like the Highlanders of Scotland, placed their best-armed soldiers in the first line, and by these the battle was begun and generally decided. Hence these ἥρωες or ὁπλῖται were called πρυλέες,—which is interpreted πρόμαχοι (see Hermann, *Opusc.* IV. p. 289; Müller, *Dor.* III. 12, § 10), and is undoubtedly another form of προιλέες; and hence the skirmish or battle between the van of the two armies was termed *προ-ίλιον* or *prœlium.* This etymology is confirmed by the obvious derivation of *milites.* The Greek language expressed large numbers in terms derived from common objects: thus, χίλιοι, "a thousand," is connected with χιλός, "a heap of fodder," from χέω, "to scatter abroad;" and μύριοι, "ten thousand," with μύρω, "to pour forth water." Similarly, the Latin

m-ile, "a thousand," means only "a large number," "a crowd" (*ὁμ-ιλία*); and *m-il-ites* are "those who march in a large body" (compare *pari-etes*, "those which go round," scil. the house), *i. e.* "the common soldiers" (cf. above, p. 25). So that we have three classes of warriors: (1) the *πρυλέες*, *i. e.* *προ-ιλέες* or *ἥρωες*, "the choice troops, who fought in the van;" (2) the [*ha*]*m-ilites*, or, "common soldiers, who marched in a body;" (3) the *equ-ites*, or "cavalry, who went on horseback." The *rorarii* seem to have derived their name from the idea of spreading out or pouring forth, which is conveyed by *χίλιοι* and *μύριοι*, and not from the fanciful resemblance of slight drops before a heavy shower.

In the same way as the diphthong AI becomes I_1, the diphthong AU becomes U_1: comp. *causa*, *ac-cuso*; *claudo*, *in-cludo*; &c. The same is the case with the Greek diphthong *ου*, *Θουκυδίδης*, *Thucydides*, &c.; and even with its Latin equivalent *ou*,—thus we have *indouco* for *indūco* on the bronze table of Tivoli (above, Chap. VI. § 19). The diphthong AU is sometimes represented by *ô* = *au*, as in Sanscrit: comp. *plaudo*, *ex-plodo*; *Claudius*, *Clodius*; &c. In *ob-oedio*, from *audio*, AU is represented by the lighter diphthong OI; and it is a further proof of the tendency to interchange U_1 and I_1, that the diphthong OI = OE, which is so often represented by U_1, also appears as I_1: thus, *oiconomus* is written *iconomus*, *ὁδοιδόκος* appears as *hodidocus*, *Οἰνόμαος* as *Inomaus*, *κοιμητήριον* as *cimeterium*, &c. Sometimes, on the contrary, OE is represented by the first vowel only, as in *diocesis*, *poema*, &c., from *διοίκησις*, *ποίημα*, &c. (see Gifanius, in *Mureti Opp.* I. p. 550, Ruhnken.). With regard to *ποιέω*, the omission of the *ι* was common enough in Greek (see Porson, *Tracts*, p. 63; Dindorf, *ad Arist. Nub.* 1448, *Acharn.* 410). The pronunciation of *yi* = *υι*, as in Ilithyia = *Εἰλείθυια*, is best explained on the hypothesis that the *y* = *υ* became evanescent, just as the *a* in *ai* and *au* is omitted in the derived forms, for *yi* = *υι* is certainly pronounced with a single utterance. That *ui* may be shortened to *i* is clear from the forms *posit* for *posuit* (Orelli, *C. I.* nos. 71, 1732, 1475, 3087, 4139), *tis* for *tuis* (Id. no. 4847), *sis* for *suis* (Lucr. III. 1038; V. 1076. Fest. s. v. *sos*). In the same way *uu* is shortened into *u* (Orelli, nos. 1108, 3488) and *ii* into *i* (Gruter, p. DLXXIII., and cf. all the genitives of nouns in *ius*).

U_2.—This is the common short U of the Romans. It corre-

sponds generally to the short o of the Greeks; and nouns of the o-declension always exhibit this u in Latin: comp. λύκος, *lupus;* ἵππος, *equus;* &c. It is probably a remnant of the Etruscan u. In the older Latin inscriptions we have seen *o* used for this value of *u*. Thus we have *consol* for *consul*, *Luciom* for *Lucium*, &c.

U_3.—This letter, like I_3, must be considered as a point of contact between I and U. Indeed, it may be doubtful in some cases whether U_3 has not been written for I_3. The passage of this U_3 into an approximate I is of the following nature:—First, a short o is changed into U_2. The genitive of the Greek imparisyllabic declension ends in *-os*: for this the oldest Latin substitutes *-us*, as in *Castorus*, *nominus*, &c. compared with *Senatuos*, &c. Some of these old genitives remained to the end of the language, as *alius*, *ejus*, *hujus*, *illius*, &c. Again, the 1st pers. plur. of the Greek verb ended in *-ομεν* = *-ομες*: for this the old Romans wrote *-umus*, a form still preserved in *sumus* and *volumus*. Again, in old Latin the vowel of the crude form is preserved in the inflexions, as in *arcu-bus*, *optu-mus*, *pontu-fex*, &c. But in all three cases the later Latin exhibits an I: thus we have *Castoris*, *nominis*, &c.; *dicimus*, *scribimus*, &c.; *arcibus*, *optimus*, *pontifex*, &c. In these cases we observe that U = O passes into a simple I. But there are other instances in which the transition seems to go still farther. As the reduplication-syllable is generally shorter than the root-syllable in the preterite of verbs, we should expect that the U or O in the first syllable of *cu-curri*, *mo-mordi*, *pu-pugi*, *tu-tudi*, would be an approximation to U_3.[1] Then, again, in *cultus*, *culmen*, &c. from *colo*, *columen*, &c., the U is clearly less significant than O, though the U here may have been partly occasioned by that affinity between *u* and *l* of which the French furnishes so many examples, and which we also see in the transition from the Greek Ἀσκλήπιος, Ἡρακλῆς to the Latin *Æsculapius*, *Hercules*. But there are some cases in which we conclude that the U, which is written, has less weight even than I. This might be inferred from *con-culco*, the secondary form of *calco*, which, according to

[1] The older writers wrote *memordi*, *peposci*, *pepugi*, *spepondi*, according to Gellius, *N. A.* VII. 9, who, however, says of the common spelling, "ita nunc omnes ferme doctiores hujusmodi verbis utuntur."

the above table, should be either *con-cilco* or *con-celco;* and also from *difficultas, sepultus,* derived from *difficilis* and *sepelio.* The fact seems to be, that what would be I before R, becomes U_3 before L; so that U_3, I_3, are both ultimate forms of their respective vowels, and as such are in a state of convergence.

Accordingly, if we should seek to arrange the Latin vowels in regard to their comparative weight, we should, as the result of this inquiry, have the following order:

$\bar{A}$ (as in *musâ,* &c.); $\bar{U}_1$, $\bar{I}_1$; A; O, U_2, I_2; E; U_3, I_3.

§ 6. *The Greek Letters used by the Romans.*

The Greek letters subsequently employed by the Romans were Z, K, and Y. The period at which the first of these was introduced is doubtful; for while, on the one hand, we are told that z is found in the Salian songs (Velius Longus, p. 2217: "Mihi videtur nec aliena sermoni fuisse z littera, cum inveniatur in carmine Saliari"), on the other hand, we find that, even in words borrowed from the Greek, this letter is represented by *di,* as in *Sabadius* for Σέβαζος (Apulei *Met.* VIII. 170), *judaidiare* for *judaizare* (Commodian, *Instruct. adv. Gent.* c. XXXVII. 634), *trapedia* for *trapeza* (*Auctor. Rei. Agrar.* p. 248), *schidia* for *schiza, oridia* for *oriza,* &c. (vide Schneid. *Elementarl.* I. p. 386; and Lobeck, *Aglaoph.* p. 296, note *l.*) The fact seems to be, that the Romans had two different characters to express the two different values of the Greek z, which was a dental, either assibilated (as σδ), or softened (as δy). Now, in its latter use it becomes equivalent to the softened guttural; for the dental and guttural, when combined with *y,* which is the ultimate vocalisation of the gutturals, converge in the sound of our *j* or *sh* (*New Crat.* §§ 112, 216). When, therefore, the Greek z more nearly approximates to the sound σδ, either this is preserved in the Latin transcriptions, as in *Mesdentius, Sdepherus,* for *Mezentius, Zephyrus* (Max. Victor. p. 1945); or the δ is assimilated to the σ, as in *Messentius, massa, Atticisso, comissor, badisso, malacisso,* &c., by the side of *Mezentius,* μάζα, Ἀττικίζω, κωμάζω, βαδίζω, μαλακίζω, &c.; or else one or other of the two component parts is omitted, as in *Saguntus* for *Zakynthus,* or *Medentius* for *Mezentius.* In this case, too, we may consider that the letter *x* occasionally steps in, as in *rixa* by the side of ἔρι[δ]ς. When, however, the Greek z is a *softened*

δ, and therefore equivalent to a *softened guttural*, we find that it is represented either by the full combination *di*, as in the cases quoted above, or else by the vocalised guttural (*j*) only. Of this latter substitution there are numberless instances: such as, *Ju-piter*, Ζεὺς πατήρ; *jugum*, ζεῦγος; &c. Of these the most important are the cases connected with the first-quoted example, *Ju-piter* = *Dies-pater;* and I must take this opportunity of returning to one etymology belonging to this class, which has always appeared to me to open the way to a chain of the most interesting associations.

It has been shown elsewhere (*N. Crat.* § 116) how the Greek H, originally the mark of aspiration, came to be used as a sign for the long *e*. Out of that investigation it appeared—(1) that a short vowel aspirated may be equivalent to an unaspirated long vowel; (2) that the vocalised consonants *i* and *u* may change their place; (3) that these vocalised consonants may be absorbed into or represented by the long vowel only. To the instances given there, I will now add the iota subscriptum of the Greek dative, and the Ionic Greek absorption of *υ* after *ω*, as in *θῶμα*, *ἐωυτοῦ*, &c.[1] These principles explain the connexion between *ἦπαρ*, *jecur* (Sanscr. *yakrit*); *ἥμισυ*, *διάμεσος*, *dimidius;* and between *ἡμέρα* = *διάμερος*, and *dies*[2] (comp. *diuturnus*, *juturna; Diana*, *Janus*, &c.). Now, besides *ἡμέρα*, we have an adjective *ἥμερος*, "civilised," "cultivated," &c., the regular antithesis of *ἄγριος*; and it has been suggested (ibid. § 150), that this word was originally applied to a country through which there was a road or passage, a country divided by a road (*διάμερος*); just as *ἄγριος* was properly applied to a rude, open country, with nothing but *ἄγροι*[3]. This is sufficiently

---

[1] In many editions of Herodotus we have these words written *θῶϋμα*, *ἑωϋτοῦ*, &c.; but the accentuation of *θῶυμα* sufficiently proves that it is a dissyllable; and even if we had not this evidence, it would be contrary to all analogy to infer a resolution of a diphthong in a crasis, the sole object of which is to shorten the word. Why should *τὠυτό* be written, if it were a word of as many syllables as *τὸ αὐτό*?

[2] In the name of the city Ἰμέρα (another form of *ἡμέρα*, see Böckh's note on Pindar, *O.* XII. 13-21, p. 210), the preposition *διά* is represented by the aspirated *ι*. In the words *anti-quus*, *posti-cus*, from *antea*, *postea*, we have *ī* = *eā* = *eai*.

[3] Hence *χῶρος* with its old synonym *χόρος* (*New Crat.* § 280), may be considered as an adjective agreeing with the suppressed word *ἄγρος*, just

proved by Æsch. *Eumen.* 13, 14: *κελευθόποιοι παῖδες Ἡφαίστου, χθόνα ἀνήμερον τιθέντες ἡμερωμένην.* Pind. *Isthm.* III. 76 (IV. 97): *ναυτιλίαισί τε πορθμὸν ἀμερώσατο.* Herod. I. 126: *ἐνθαῦτα ὁ Κῦρος (ἦν γὰρ ὁ χῶρος—ἀκανθώδης—) τοῦτόν σφι τὸν χῶρον προεῖπε ἐξημερῶσαι ἐν ἡμέρᾳ.* IV. 118: *τοὺς αἰεὶ ἐμποδὼν γινομένους ἡμεροῦται πάντας.* In all of these passages the verb *ἡμερόω* implies making a clear passage or road; and in Plato (*Legg.* p. 761 A.) the adjective *ἥμερος* is used as a predicate of *ὁδός*: *ὁδῶν τε ἐπιμελουμένους, ὅπως ὡς ἡμερώτατα ἕκασται γίγνωνται*[1]. That the Greeks connected road-making with civilisation in general, and with the peaceful commerce of man with man, appears from many passages (Aristotle, *περὶ θαυμασίων ἀκουσμάτων*, c. 85, p. 837, Bekk.; Thucydides, I. 2, compared with I. 13, &c.); and this is generally implied in all the legends relating to Hercules and Theseus. But it has not been sufficiently remarked that this road-making was also intimately connected with the cultivation of land. It may, however, be shown, that as the Greek *ἄγρος* becomes *ἥμερος* when divided by a road, by a similar process the Latin *ager* becomes *jugerum* = *di-ager-um.*

Whenever a piece of unemployed ground—of *ager*, so called—was to be taken into use, whether for cultivation, or for the site of a city or a camp, the rules of the ancient *limitatio* were immediately applied. Now this very word *limitatio* signifies, the dividing of a certain piece of ground into main-roads (*viæ*) and cross-roads (*limites*); and the same primary notion is conveyed by *tem-plum*, so obviously derived from *tem-no*, Gr. *τάμ-νω*, comp. *τέμενος*, &c. For in all *limitation* the first thing done was to observe the *templum*, i. e. as we should say, to take the bearing by the compass[2]. Suppose the

---

as *χώρα* refers to the suppressed word *γῆ*: and thus *χῶρος* signifies "land not built on"—either the open space in a town, or fields in the country (Herod. II. 154: *δίδωσι χώρους ἐνοικῆσαι*),—and *χώρα* rather signifies "a region," "a territory," in the wider sense.

[1] The word *ἤπειρος* = *ἡ διαπέραν χώρα*, furnishes another instance of the substitution of *η* for *διά*: comp. the epithet *διαπρύσιος*, Pind. *N.* IV. 51, where see the note.

[2] Most ancient nations seem to have connected the *regiones cœli* with the *regiones viarum.* Thus in old English "the milky way" was called "Watling-street," which was the name of one of the four great roads in this country; see Grimm, *Deutsche Myth.* p. 330, 2d ed.

augur stood with his back to the north, then the line from north to south would be called the *cardo*, as corresponding to the axis of the globe; and that from east to west, which cut the *cardo* at right angles, would be called the *decumanus*, or "tenth line." For both these lines repeated themselves according to the number of separate allotments into which the land was divided, or the number of separate streets in the city or camp[1]. Now the Roman *actus* or *fundus* = [120 feet] was the unit of subdivision; two of these *fundi* made a *jugerum* = *di-ager-um*, and two *jugera* constituted the *heredium* of a Roman patrician: consequently, 200 *jugera* made up the *ager limitatus* of a century of the old Roman populus (Fest. s. v. *Centuriatus*, p. 53). If this *ager limitatus*, then, were arranged as a square, we have, of course, for each side 20 × 120 feet. Supposing, then, a road between each two of the *fundi*,—which there must have been, as every two *fundi* made a *di-ager-um*,—the *cardo* which passed between the tenth and eleventh *fundus* would be properly called the *decumanus*, and it would consequently be the main road, and would be terminated by the main gate (*porta decumana*). The point at which the *decumanus* crossed the *cardo* was called *groma* or *gruma*; and here, in a city or camp, the two cross-roads seem to have spread themselves out into a kind of *forum*. There is as much probability in the supposition that the immortal name of Rome was derived from this ancient word, as there is in any of the numerous etymologies suggested by Festus (p. 266). From this it appears, that among the Romans it was the same thing to speak of a territory as divided by roads, and to call it cultivated, occupied, or built upon; and the *jugerum*, or divided *ager*, implied both. To the same principle

[1] It would seem that the word *sicilicus* (from *seco*) was properly and originally applied to this apportionment of land. In the Bantine Table (l. 25) we have *nep him pruhipid mais zicolois* x *nesimois*; which I have translated (above, p. 127): *ne in hoc prœhibeat* (i.e. *prœbeat*) *plus sicilicis* x *contiguis*. According to Klenze (*Abhandl.* p. 50) x *nesimois* = *decimis*; but I cannot understand why we should have an ordinal here. The root of *ne-simus* appears in *nahe, near, next*, &c.; and I would understand it of so many adjoining allotments. The *sicilicus* was 600 square feet, *i. e.* $\frac{1}{48}$ of the jugerum, or $\frac{1}{24}$ of the actus. Consequently, the 30 contiguous *sicilici* mentioned in l. 17 would be $\frac{5}{8}$ of the jugerum, or $\frac{5}{4}$ of the actus; and the ten contiguous *sicilici* would, therefore be $\frac{5}{24}$ of the former and $\frac{5}{12}$ of the latter.

we may refer the importance attached by the ancients to straight ploughing[1]; for the furrow was the first element of the road; and the *urbs* itself was only that space round which the plough had been formally and solemnly drawn.

The Romans were very sparing in their use of the Greek letter K. It was occasionally employed to form the syllable *ka*, as in *kalumnia, kandidatus, kaput, Karthago, Kastor, evokatus, judikandus, Parkarum;* but in these instances it was considered quite superfluous; and Quintilian thinks (I. 4, 9, and 7, 10) that its use ought to be restricted to those cases in which it serves as the conventional mark of an abbrevation, as in *K.* = *Kæso*, and *K.* or *Kal.* = *Kalendæ*. Isidor (*Origg.* 1, 4) and Petrus Diaconus (p. 1582, Putsch) tell us that the letter *K* was added to the Roman alphabet by the *ludi-magister* Sallustius, in order to mark a distinction between K and Q. It occurs in the oldest Latin inscription which has come down to us (above, p. 220) in the Greek word *Kastorus*, and was probably suggested by an increased intercourse with the Greek colonies of southern Italy long before Sp. Carvilius introduced the distinction between C and G.

The letter Y was never used by the Romans except as the transcription of *υ* in words derived either from or through the Greek; and it seems to have been a representative of those sounds which have been designated above by the characters U_1 and U_2, both of which involve an approximation to the sound of I. Hence, in the French alphabet it is not improperly called "the Greek *i*" (*i grec*). In many words, rather connected with the Greek than derived from it, the *υ* is represented by I, as in *cliens, in-clitus* (κλύω), *clipeus* (κρύπτω), *silva* (ὕλFη), &c.; while in others the *υ* has become E, as in *socer* (ἑκυρός), *remulco* (ῥυμουλκέω), *polenta* (παλυντή), &c. The Roman U_2 sometimes represents the common *υ* of the Greeks, as in *lupus* (λύκος), *nunc* (νῦν), *fui* (φύω), &c.; sometimes the Greek *o*, as in all nouns of the *o*-declension.

---

[1] See Hesiod. *Op. et D.* 443:

ὅς κ' ἔργου μελετῶν ἰθεῖαν αὔλακ' ἐλαύνοι,
μηκέτι παπταίνων μεθ' ὁμήλικας.

Luke ix. 62; and comp. the tropical use of *delirare*.

§ 7. *The Numeral Signs.*

This examination of the Latin alphabet will not be complete without some remarks on the signs which were used by the Romans to denote the numeral adjectives. Priscian, in his usual school-boy way, has endeavoured to establish the connexion between the numeral signs as we have them, and the ordinary Roman capitals. Thus, *quinque*, he tells us, is represented by V, because this is the fifth vowel; *quinquaginta* is L, because, etymologically, L and N may be interchanged, and N is *πεντήκοντα* in Greek; *quingenti* is D, because this is the next letter to C!—and so forth (Priscian, II. p. 388, ed. Krehl).

Now there can be no doubt that the Roman numeral signs are derived from the Tuscans; though in certain cases a Roman capital has been substituted for an Etruscan character which does not correspond to it in value, and though in these instances the figures are either inclined or reversed. The Etruscan characters are as follows:—

I, II, III, IIII, Λ, ΛI, ΛII, ΛIII, IX, X, &c.
1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.
XX, XXX, XXXX, or XT T, TX, &c.
20, 30, 40, 50, 60,
⊕, 8, ᗡ, ᗡ, &c.
100, 1000, 5000, 10000.

It is sufficiently obvious that the first ten of these characters are identical with the Roman figures, the Λ, &c. being reversed; and as T is often written T, and as ⊥ ⊥, frequently occur on Roman family coins, we may recognise in this character the original of the Roman L, and therefore identify the Etruscan and Roman ciphers from 1 to 99. The Roman C and the Etruscan ⊕ do not appear to be connected; but the Etruscan 8, or, as it is also written ⦶, is clearly the same as the Roman ⊕, ⦶, and cIↄ, for which M was subsequently written; and the same remark applies to the still higher numbers.

If, then, the Roman ciphers were derived from the Tuscans, it is obvious that we must seek in the Tuscan language for an interpretation. Now it cannot be doubted that the Tuscan numeral signs are either letters of the alphabet slightly changed,

or combinations of such characters made according to fixed rules. Thus, Λ is the inverted V = *u*; ⅂ or T is an inverted ⅄ = *ch*[1]; and 8 = *f*. Since, therefore, the position of these letters in the organic alphabet does not correspond to their value as numeral signs, we must conclude that they represent the initials of the numerals in the Etruscan, just as M afterwards denoted *mille* in the Latin language. We do not know any Etruscan numeral, and therefore cannot pretend to any certainty on this subject; but this is the most probable inference. The manner in which the elementary signs are combined to form the intermediate numerals is more easily and safely investigated. The character denoting unity is perhaps selected from its simplicity; it is the natural and obvious *score* in every country. This character is combined with itself to form the next three digits, though four is sometimes expressed as 5 − 1, according to the principle of subtraction so common among the Romans (comp. *duodeviginti*, &c.). The same plan is adopted to form the numerals between 5 and 10. The number 10 is represented by a combination of two V's —thus, X; and this figure enclosed in a circle indicates the multiplication of 10 by itself, or 100. The letter 8, or ⦶, being assumed as the representative of 1000, its half, or D, would indicate 500; and as multiplication by ten was indicated by a circle in the case of 100, on the same principle ⦶ would be 10,000, and its half or ⦶ would represent 5000.

These rules for the formation of one numeral from another are more obvious than the origin of the elementary numeral signs. But where certainty is not within our reach, we must be contented with a solution of those difficulties which may be submitted with safety to a philological analysis.

---

[1] It is possible that this character may be the half of that which denotes 100, according to the principle stated below.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE LATIN CASE-SYSTEM.

§ 1. Fulness and deficiencies of the Latin case-system. § 2. General scheme of the case-endings. § 3. Differences of crude form. § 4. Hypothetical forms of the nominative and accusative plural. § 5. Existing forms—the genitive. § 6. The dative and locative. § 7. The accusative singular. § 8. The ablative. § 9. The neuter forms. § 10. The vocative. § 11. Adverbs considered as cases of nouns. § 12. Adverbial expression for the day of the month.

§ 1. *Fulness and deficiencies of the Latin case-system.*

THE system of cases, with which the Latin noun is furnished, presents a greater abundance and variety of forms than that of the Greek declension. The Greek noun has no distinct ablative case; its accusative has frequently lost its characteristic termination; the genitive includes the ablative meaning; and the locative is almost obsolete. The greater number and variety of the Latin cases is due to the more ancient state or condition of the language, and perhaps also to its composite structure. As the language degenerates into the so-called Romance idioms, we find that its cases are gradually lost, and their place taken by a number of prefixes, which add indeed to the syntactical distinctness of the language, but purchase this advantage by sacrificing the etymological development. The student of Latin, however, very soon discovers that the variety of case-forms is the very reverse of an advantage. For idiomatic usage has introduced so much confusion into the use of the genitive, dative, and ablative, that the two latter derive all their distinctions from the prepositions attached to the ablative, while the genitive, in many cases, differs from the ablative only as an arbitrary form, and without any reference to a distinction of meaning. If we revert to the Greek language, which still retains the more accurate distinctions of case, we shall see that the genitive, or case of ablation, denotes the origin of motion or action; the dative, or case of accession, denotes juxta-position, immediate proximity, rest and presence; the accusative, or case of transition, denotes the end of motion or action,—the object to which something is proceeding. Now the Latin, in most instances, is unable to express this simple relation of *unde, ubi,* and *quo* by the mere case-endings. If we except certain adverbs derived from nouns, certain agglutinate

forms, such as *meridie, postridie,* &c., some few nouns, as *rus, domus, humus, bellum, militia,* and the proper names of cities, we have no locative in Latin, and no case for the simple expression of departure or approach, and are obliged to use prepositions, such as *in, ab, ad,* to convey these meanings. And even with regard to the forms which are still used as locatives, differences of declension produce endless confusions, which all the old and some modern grammarians have enhanced by making arbitrary rules for differences of case in the syntax of different declensions. Thus because nouns in *-a, -us,* of the first and second declension, had a locative in *-a-i* = *æ,* and in *-o-i* = *î,* we are told that *militiæ, Romæ, domi, Cypri* are genitive cases; whereas *ruri, Carthagine, Athenis* are ablatives, because the locative approximates or corresponds to the mutilated ablative in the consonantal declension. These labourers in the work of making the Latin language unlearnable, except by the parrot use of the memory, could not perceive that as *dies* is masculine when it means "a day," *hŏ-die* and *postrī-die* must belong to the same forms, and that if the former is from *ho-i-die,* the latter must be from *postero-i-die.* The fact is that the locative originally ended in *-in* or *-im,* and this was corrupted in every form with the exception of such words as *partim, enim,* &c.; hence, to restore the original ending, we must write, with different amounts of alteration or addition, *militia-im* (*-in*), *Roma-im* (*-in*), *domo-im* (*-in*), *Cypro-im* (*-in*), *rur-im* (*-in*), *Carthagin-im* (*-in*), *Athenis-im* (*-in*).

§ 2. *General scheme of the case-endings.*

In treating of the Latin cases, our attention is directed to three different aspects under which they may be considered. We may regard them either according to a general scheme derived from all the declensions, or as modified by those varieties in the termination of the crude form which constitute differences of declension; or we may take both of these together, and add to them those additional phenomena which are furnished by the adverb. A supplementary source of information respecting the cases may be derived from those nouns, whether substantive or adjective, which are obviously formed from the oblique cases of other nouns. Thus, we know that the original Greek genitive ended in *-σιο* (Sanscr. *sya*) from the form of the possessive ad-

jective δημόσιος (Bopp, *Vergl. Gramm.* p. 294, note). Similarly, a case in *-ine*, analogous to the Sanscrit instrumental, may be inferred both from the particle *sine* and from the derivative forms *urbânus* (= *urbăinus*), &c., and *officîna* (= *officĭĭna*), &c.

If we confine ourselves to the forms of the noun, we get the following general scheme of the case-endings.

	Sing.	Plur.
Nom.	*s* (sometimes absorbed, assimilated, or dropt by *visargah*)	[*s*]*es* (variously modified)
Gen.	*is, jus, sis* (originally *-siom*)	[*r*]*um* (originally *siom-s*)
Dat.	*i* or *bi* (the *b* is preserved only in the pronouns)	[*b*]*us* = *îs*
Accus.	*m*	[*m*]*s* (the singular *m* constantly absorbed)
Abl.	*a*[*d*] (the *d* is found only in old Latin)	[*b*]*us* = *îs*
Loc.	*i*[*m*] or *i*[*n*]	*is-* [*im*] or *is-* [*in*].

§ 3. *Differences of crude form.*

By taking the different crude forms according to the usual classification, we shall at once see how this scheme is modified and applied. The declensions will be fully discussed in a separate chapter, and it will be sufficient in this place to show how the different cases attach themselves to the different characteristics.

CONSONANT-NOUNS.

	Sing.	Plur.
Nom.	*lapi*[*d*]*s*	*lapid-*[*s*]*-es* (= *ês*)
Gen.	*lapid-is*	*lapid-e-rum*[1]
Dat.	*lapid-ĭ-*[*bĭ*] (= *î*)	*lapid-i-bus*
Accus.	*lapid-e-m*	*lapid-e*[*m*]*s* (= *ês*)
Abl.	*lapid-e*[*d*]	*lapid-i-bus*
Loc.	*lapid-im?*	*lapid-is-im?*

VOWEL-NOUNS.

A

	Sing.	Plur.
Nom.	*familiă-*[*s*]	*familia-*[*sĕs*] (= *ai, æ*)
Gen.	*familia-is* (= *âs, āi, æ*)	*familia-rum*
Dat.	*familia-*[*b*]*i* (= *æ*)	*familia-bus* (= *îs*)[2]

---

[1] Charisius, I. 40.

[2] For the form in *-bus* comp. Orelli, *Inscr.* nos. 1628, 1629, 4601, &c.; and K. L. Schneider, *Formenlehre*, I. pp. 25, sqq.

Accus.	*familia-m*	*familia-[m]s* (= *âs*)
Abl.	*familia-[d]* (= *â*)	*familia-i-bus*
Loc.	*familia-i* (= *æ*)	*familia-is-im?*

E = A-I

	Sing.	Plur.
Nom.	*die-s* = *dia-is*	*die-[se]s*
Gen.	*die-i[s]*[1]	*die-rum*
Dat.	*die-[b]i*	*die-bus*
Accus.	*die-[m]*	*die-[m]s*
Abl.	*die-[d]*	*die-bus*
Loc.	*die* = *dia-i[m]*	*die-sim?*

I

	Sing.	Plur.
Nom.	*avi-s*	*avi-[sĕ]s* (= *ês*)
Gen.	*avi-is* (= *avyis, avis*)	*avi-[r]um*
Dat.	*avi-[b]i* (= *avî*)	*avi-bus*
Accus.	*avi-m* (= *em*)	*avi-[m]s* (= *ês*)
Abl.	*avi-[d]*	*avi-bus*
Loc.	*avi-[m]?*	*avi-sim?*

O

	Sing.	Plur.
Nom.	*avo-s*	*avo-ses* (= *avî*, as in gen. sing.)
Gen.	*avo-is* (or *sus* or *syo*, = *io*, = *î*)[2]	*avo-erum*
Dat.	*avo-[b]i* (= *ô*)	*avo-ibus* (= *îs*)
Accus.	*avo-m*	*avo-[m]s* (= *ôs*)[3]
Abl.	*avo[d]*	*avo-ibus* (= *îs*)
Loc.	*avo-i-[m]* = *av-î*	*avo-is-[im]?*

---

[1] This genitive appears sometimes under the form *-es*, sometimes also under the form *-i*, as: *pernicies*, gen. *pernicies*, *progenies*, gen. *progenii*. See the passages quoted by Schwartze, *das alte Ægypten*, p. 565.

[2] As δημόσιο, δήμοιο, δήμου, comp. the nom. plural.

[3] The dative or ablative in *-bus* is sometimes found in those nouns which have *e* or *i* before the characteristic: thus we have *diibus* from *deus* (Gruter, II. 9; XXIV. 6; XLVI. 9); and *filibus* from *filius* (id. DLIII. 8; DLIV. 4).

U

	Sing.	Plur.
Nom.	*fructu-s*	*fructu-ses* (= *ûs*)
Gen.	*fructu-is* (= *ûs*)	*fructu-e*[*r*]*um*
Dat.	*fructu-*[*b*]*i* (= *û*)	*fructu-ibus*
Accus.	*fructu-m*	*fructu-*[*m*]*s* (= *ûs*)
Abl.	*fructu-*[*d*]	*fructu-ibus*
Loc.	*fructu-im?*	*fructu-is-im?*

§ 4. *Hypothetical forms of the nominative and accusative plural.*

If now we compare these particular instances with the general scheme, we shall see that, taking all the varieties of the crude form, of which the above are specimens, there are only two assumptions in the general table,—namely, the original forms of the nominative and accusative plural. All the others are actually found, either in nouns or pronouns, at some epoch of the language.

With regard to the nominative and accusative plural, the assumed original forms are derived from a sound induction according to the principles of comparative philology.

And first with regard to the nominative plural. The sign of this case must have been originally *-s* throughout the declensions. Now it appears from general considerations, as well as from an induction of facts, that *-s* was also the sign of the nominative singular (*New Cratylus*, § 243). Therefore the *-s* of the nominative plural, if it was to distinguish the form from the same case in the singular, cannot have been appended to the mere crude form of the noun; for then the nominatives singular and plural would have been one and the same inflexion. It must have been formed by adding the *-s* (with, of course, an intervening short vowel, for the Latin language does not tolerate a double *-s* at the end of a word) to the full form of the nominative, and thus constituting, as the total addition to the crude form, or the real termination, the syllable *-ses*. If we compare *lapid-ēs*, *patr-ēs*, with ἐλπίδ-ες, πατέρ-ες, we shall see that the long *e* in the Latin words cannot be accounted for otherwise than by the absorption of an *s*, which has probably become vocalized in *i*. In the Greek forms this *s*, like the *ν* of the accusative, has been

dropt altogether. This view is supported, not only by the fact that the plurals *vo-bis*, λόγο-ι-ς, &c., actually stand in this relation to the singulars *ti-bi*, λόγῳ = λόγο-ι, &c., but even more so by the analogy of the genitive singular. For in many cases the genitive singular is identical, in its secondary form, with the nominative plural: thus *familiæ*, *avi*, are the common forms of both cases. But *familiæ* is actually written *familiâs* = *familiaĕs* in compounds with *pater*, *mater*, *filius*, &c. Hence we may presume the same original form of the nominative plural *familiæ* (compare *dies*, &c). Now the original form of the nom. singular must have been *familiă-s*; consequently, if, when the nom. sing. was *familia*, the nom. plur. was *familia-ĕs* = *familiæ*, it follows that when the nom. sing. was *familiă-s*, the nom. plur. must have been *familia-sĕs*. The same follows from the form *avi*. The omission of *s* between two vowels is fully supported by Greek analogies: for if ἐλέγου is manifestly a corruption of ἐλέγεσο, ἴχθυες may well be a similar corruption of ἴχθυσες. I have preferred to treat the original form of the nominative plural as an assumption, and to support it by the arguments which I have just adduced; but if we remember that the original s of many Roman words was not changed into R till about the 4th century A.U.C. (above, Ch. VII. § 3), we might take the existence of such forms as *spe-res* (which occurs in fragments of Ennius), and *gnaru-res* (which is found in Plautus, *Mostellaria*, I. 2, 17; *Pœnulus*, prol. 47), as a distinct confirmation of the theory. And here again the analogy of the genitive becomes applicable, as will be seen below (§ 5). The pronouns also supply a partial confirmation of the above induction; for though in common Latin we find a genitive singular in *-s* by the side of a nominative plural in *-i*, we learn from old inscriptions that there was also a nominative plural in *-s:* see *Senatus Cons. de Bacch.* ll. 3, 7; *Lex Rom. Bant. Tab.* l. 21; Klenze *ad Leg. Servil.* p. 12.

Again, in regard to the accusative plural, which in all the above instances ends in *-s* preceded by a long vowel, we must infer that *-s* is the termination of the plural as such, from considerations of the same nature with those which have just been brought forward. We should also have no difficulty in supposing that the long vowel indicates the absorption of some consonant. This consonant can only be the *-m* of the accusative singular; for not only is this most probable *à priori*, but it is

the only supposition which explains all the phenomena. Let us take the Greek, Latin, Sanscrit, and Gothic forms in a particular word; and we shall see that, while the Gothic alone preserves the outward marks of such a derivation of the accusative plural from the accusative singular, the only possible explanation of the other forms is the supposition that they were originally identical with the Gothic. Thus, λύκο-ν, *lupu-m*, *vṛ̆ka-m*, *vulfa-n*, are the accusative singular of synonymous words in these four languages. The plural of the Gothic *vulfa-n* is simply *vulfa-n-s*, whereas all the other forms strengthen the final vowel of the crude form, and drop one of the concluding consonants: λύκον becomes λύκους, *lupum* is converted into *lupôs*, and *vṛ̆kam* into *vṛ̆kân*. The comparison of ὀδούς, &c., with *dens*, &c., shows us that λύκους may stand for λύκονς; and the analogy of τύπτων = τύπτον[τ]ς is sufficient to explain the change of *vṛ̆kans* into *vṛ̆kân*. The Umbrian also has shown us both the original formation and the corruption of the accusative plural: for while we have *abron-s* exactly corresponding to the Gothic *vulfan-s*, we have also *abrof*, which, as I have shown (above, p. 91), must have proceeded from *abrom-h* = *abrom-s*. If we add to this, that when the accusative singular has lost its final consonant, the plural accusative merely adds *-s* to the existing form of the singular (as in ἄνδρα[ν], τύπτοντα[ν], sing., ἄνδρᾰ-ς, τύπτοντᾰ-ς, plural), we have, it should seem, the most satisfactory evidence which the subject admits, in support of the assumed original form of the accusative plural.

Having thus justified the only hypothetical forms in the above scheme of cases, it will be desirable to make some remarks on the most striking peculiarities in the existing inflexions.

§ 5. *Existing forms—the Genitive.*

In the general scheme, the genitive singular is characterised by the terminations *-is*, *-sis*, or *-jus*; the gen. plural by the ending *-rum*, where the *r* is generally dropt, except in the *a*, *e*, and *o* declensions, which constantly retain it. The difficulty here felt is, to connect the plural form with the singular. Struve's assertion (*über die Lat. Decl.* 3, 15), that the *r* is merely euphonic, would tend, if we assented to it, to complicate and increase this difficulty in no small degree. The comparative philologer cannot doubt that the original form of the genitive

plural in the Indo-Germanic languages was that which is preserved in the Sanscrit *-sâm*=ΣΩΜ (see Müller *ad Varron. L. L.* VIII. § 74, p. 192). This form, after the fourth century A. U. C., would appear in Latin as ROM, which was afterwards softened into RŬM. The Indians wrote *-nâm* for *-sâm* in many of their words where the *n* represents the *s*, as in *vṛĭkân* for *vṛĭkâs*=*vṛĭkăm-s*; but in the pronouns, which generally preserve the authentic forms longer than the nouns, we have *tâ-sâm*=*istâ-rum*. The Greeks very often omitted an σ- between two vowels in a case like this; and as they wrote ἐλέγου for ἐλέγεσο, ἴχθυ-ες for ἴχθυσ-ες, so they gave us δήμοιο, or ultimately δήμου, for the original δημόσιο, and μουσά-ων, or ultimately μουσῶν, for μουσάσων = μουσα-σιον-ς. That *-rum* is the proper and genuine form of the Latin genitive is proved not merely by the fact that the Romans actually wrote *-um* for *-orum* when it suited their convenience[1], thereby showing the reason for the omission of the *r* in the other declensions, but also by the fact that the *r* is found in the pronouns, the oldest and most immutable parts of speech, and that in the more ancient state of the language even nouns of the other declensions retained the *r*: thus we hear of such words as *boverum, Joverum* (Varro, *L. L.* VIII. § 74), *lapiderum, nucerum, regerum* (Cn. Gellius *apud Charisium*, I. 40). This evidence receives very striking confirmation from the analogy of the genitive singular. The most common characteristic of the genitive singular is the termination *-is*. There are reasons, however, which may induce us to doubt if this is the full and original form of the genitive-ending. The Sanscrit *vṛĭkăsya* compared with λύκοιο, and the possessive δημόσιος by the side of δημό-ιο, might lead us to suspect that the termination commenced with an *s*, which was subsequently absorbed; and this suspicion is confirmed by the fact, that there are, in old Latin, genitives ending in *-ris*=*-sis* where the *r*=*s* is not part of the crude form. Thus we have *sue-ris* for *suis* in the fragment of Plautus quoted by Festus, s. v. *Spetile*, p. 330: "Esto pernam, sumen *sueris*, spetile, callum, glandia." Compare Varro, *L. L.* V. § 110, p. 44. And from the extant forms of the nominative plural in *-res* we may fairly infer that the genitive in *-ris*=*sis* was not uncommon. The Latin possessive adjectives end in *-ius* or *-eus*, e. g. *prætor-ius* from *prætor*, *virgin-eus* from

[1] On this abbreviation, see Cicero's remarks in *Orator.* c. 46, § 155.

virgo, (*virgin-*); and as the analogy of *δημό-σιος*, *vrĭkă-sya*, leads us to an assumption of an original *-sius*, we must insert *s* also in the pronominal genitives in *-jus*, *-ius*, which, as we shall see in a subsequent chapter, are derived from the possessives of the pronouns. We cannot doubt that adjectives in *-ιος* = *-σιος* are formed from the genitive in *-ιο* = *-σιο*, and as these adjectives are only weaker forms of the quasi-comparatives in *-ιων* = *-σιον-ς*, the original form of the genitive must have been *-σιον* in Greek, which would amount to *-sĭŏm* in Latin; and the plural, originally *-σιων* = *σιον-ς*, in the former language, would become *siŏm-s* = *siûm* in Latin, from which it is softened to *-sŭm*, just as the *-ως* of *πόλεως* falls into *-ŭs* in *cu-jŭs*, &c. Compare also the Sanscrit dual *-bhyâm* with the plural *-bhyăs* or *bhis*.

§ 6. *The Dative and Locative.*

In Greek, the dative, as the case denoting rest and proximity, indicates whatever is close at hand, and thus implies the instrument or occasion, as well as that which is receptive of gain, or that which is the locality of the action. In other words, it includes the three Sanscrit cases, which are denoted as the instrumental, the dative, and the locative. These three cases end in *-ina*, *-aya*, and *-i*. There is reason to believe that the first of these affixes is the original type. It is identical with the forms *ἀ-νά*, *ἴ-να*, originally *Fα-να*, and it thus appears that it is only partially represented by *-φι*, *-bi*, *-i*, which are the usual terminations of the Greek and Latin dative and locative. The Greek pronouns, *ἐμίν*, *τεΐν*, *τίν*, *ἵν*, *σφίν*, *φίν*, *ψίν*, contain the whole affix, and it always appears in the Greek dual, as in *αὐ-τό-ιν* = *αὐτό-φιν*, where the characteristic of plurality is omitted, as in the Latin plural *-sum* = *-rum*. We may also conclude that the Latin *-bis*, in *no-bis*, *vo-bis*, has lost the *n* necessary to the full form, which is preserved in the particle *s-ine*, which is presumed in words like *officîna*, and which appears slightly altered from the Sanscrit instrumental in words like *partim*, *enim*, *olim*, *istim*. The termination *-bi* = *-φι* is dative and instrumental in *ti-bi*, *vo-bis*, but simply local in *u-bi*, *i-bi*, &c. Commonly the Latin locative ends in *-i*, agreeing in this with the Sanscrit. But when the characteristic of the noun is a consonant, it is generally shortened into *e*, especially if the word is of more than two syllables. The locative of *rus* is *ruri*. In the plural the dative

and locative are always confused with the ablative; and instances occur even in classical Latin where the dative of an ordinary noun, with the sense of limitation, appears in the form of the ablative in *e*. In some phrases this is rather the rule than the exception; such are *pignore dare*, for *pignori;* III*viri auro argento ære flando feriundo*, for *æri; jure dicundo* for *juri; qui dant quique accipiunt fœnore*, for *fœnori;* &c. (see Schneider, *Lat. Gr.* II. pp. 200, sqq.; Müller, *ad Varro. L. L.* V. p. 16). If there is any reason for using the term *dativus* in reference to the case of a noun, it must surely be applicable to *morte* in the epitaph of Plautus, quoted by Gellius (*N. A.* I. 84): Postquam est *morte* datus Plautus, Comœdia luget,—for here the form in *-e* actually follows a verb of *giving*. Thus we see that *ore* is not the ablative but the dative in (Virgil, *Georg.* I. 430):

si virgineum suffuderit *ore* ruborem;

and that it is a locative in (*Georg.* III. 439):

linguis micat *ore* trisulcis.

§ 7. *The Accusative Singular.*

The *m*, which marks the accusative singular in Latin and Sanscrit, is only a weaker form of the dental *ν*, which appears in Greek. This dental is the residuum of the third pronominal element, and denotes distance and objectivity. We are not to suppose that *partem* and *partim* are the same word, or generally that the accusative and locative are the same form. The *i* which appears in the latter, with or without the accusative affix, constitutes the essential difference between the two cases. Belonging to the second pronominal element, this *i* is in itself an expression of proximity; and thus, while *parte-m* denotes that "the part" is an object to be approached or acted on, *part-i-m* indicates that not only is the part an object, but also that it is close at hand for use or superposition. It is true that the temporal particles *quum, tum, nun-c, jam*, &c., are not less locative in meaning than *olim*, and that the causal *nam*, though accusative in form, coincides in signification with the locative *enim*. But we must remember that *quod, quod si, quippe* = *quia-pe*, ὅτι, ὅτε, ἅτε, &c. are used as general expressions of objectivity; and we must not allow syntactical equivalences to interfere with our etymological discrimination.

§ 8. *The Ablative.*

In ordinary Latin the ablative is used as the case of instrumentality in both numbers; and in the plural there is no distinction between it and the dative. The specimens of old Latin in Chapter VI. have sufficiently shown that the termination of the ablative was *d*, or, perhaps, at one period of the language, *t*. The instrumental ending in Sanscrit is, as we have seen, *-ina;* and the Sanscrit ablative ended, like the Latin, in *-d*. The tendency of the instrumental and ablative—the case of proximity and the case of derivation,—to interchange their significations, is a phenomenon, in which the philosophical grammarian finds no difficulty. The fact that *sine* and *sed* are so nearly synonymous is an obvious exemplification of this tendency. It is a more serious imperfection of the Latin case-system that the ablative, though distinguished in form from the genitive, should sometimes agree with it in meaning, and sometimes coincide in sense with its direct opposite the dative. With regard to the singular number, which has an ablative properly so called, there can be no doubt that in Latin and Sanscrit, as well as in Greek, the genitive and ablative are traceable to a common origin. The full, original, and proper form of the genitive singular was *-sion*, and this in Greek often appeared as *-θεν*: cf. *θεός* = *σιός*. In Sanscrit the ablative *vrikât* bears the same relation to the genitive *vrikasya* that the genitive *πόλεως* does to a more ancient *πολιόσιον*, or the adverb *καλῶς* to an original *καλο-θεν*, or the common *τύπτεις* to the inevitably assumed *τύπτε-σι*. It is well known that the Latin adverbs in *-tus* correspond to the Greek in *-θεν*; thus *cœli-tus* = *οὐρανό-θεν*; and the Greek termination *δ-* in *-δης*, &c. involves this ending *-θεν* (*New Crat.* § 263). There is therefore every reason to believe that the Latin ablative in *-d* or *-t* is an apocopated form of a case in *-dus* or *-tus*, which is resolvable to an ultimate identity with the genitive.

§ 9. *The Neuter Forms.*

The neuter accusative, which serves also as a nominative (see *New Crat.* § 236), ends, like the usual accusative, in *-m* in all nouns of the vowel-declensions. There is no doubt, however, that this *m* may be traced back through the dental liquid *n*, which represents it in Greek, to the dental mute *-d* or *-t*. Thus

we have *i-d, illu-d, quo-d,* &c. to the latest period of the language; we have also *met, tet, set,* or *med, ted, sed; ego-met, me-met, ted-ipsum, inter sed* (*Senat. Consult. de Bacch.* ll. 13, 14); and we shall see in the next chapter that the final *s* or *r*, in nouns like *corpu-s, robo-r, genu-s,* &c., is a softening of an original *t* or *d*. We must take care not to confuse this *t* or *d* with the same letter appearing as the affix of the ablative. The long vowel, which precedes the dental in that case, shows that there is apocope or absorption of something more than a mere consonant, and abundant reason has been given for the inference that this *d* has passed through *th* from an original sibilant representing the second pronominal element. On the contrary, the accusative *m, n, d* or *t* is merely the residuum of the third pronominal element, denoting simple objectivity. The forms of the neuter-plural show, *à fortiori,* that the dental affix in the singular was a mere letter, and not a syllable, as in the case of the ablative. For all neuter nouns, to whatever declension they belong, form their plural nominative-accusative in *ă* in the Zend and in the old European languages of this family. Now the Greek language shows us that *n,* when it stands by itself at the end of a word, or precedes a dental mute, may be changed into *ă*, and this vowel may even represent the combination *-ντ*. Thus we have *πάτερᾰ* for *πάτερν*, *τετύφαται* for *τετύφνται*, *σωζοίατο* for *σώζοιντο*, *πάθος* for *πένθος*, and even *δέκα* for *δέκεντ*, and *σῶμα* for *σώμεντ*. There is therefore no objection, *à priori,* to the hypothesis, but rather a presumption, that the plural *-ă* represents an original *-ντ*; and it seems quite reasonable to assume that *ξύλα* = *ξύλεν-τ*; for if the objective *ν* or *τ* of the singular had to be extended into a plural, we should not in this case append the personal or subjective *s,* as in the case of masculine and feminine nouns, but should rather repeat the objective affix. Now it is known that the neuter plural in Latin originally ended in *-d;* thus we find in the *Senatus Consult. de Bacch.* l. 24: *quei advorsum ea-d fecisent.* Again, we find in Sanscrit that neuter plurals end in *-ni;* thus *madhu* = *μέθυ* makes *madhŭ-ni*=*μέθυ-α*; and the final *i* must be a vocalization of a second *n,* just as conversely *nn* is substituted for *ni* in *ξέννος* = *ξένιος* = *ξεῖνος*. Lastly, while the Erse plural of the third personal pronoun is *siâd* for *swiad,* the Welsh form of the plural is *hwynt* for *swynt.* Putting all these facts together, we must

come to the conclusion that the neuter accusative singular ended in *-m* = *-n* = *-t* or *-d*, and that the plural *ă* represents an original *-nd* = *-nt* = *-nn* or *-mm*.

The pronominal neuters in *ae*, as *quæ*, *hæc*, &c., are explained in a subsequent chapter.

§ 10. *The Vocative.*

The vocative, i. e. the case of allocution, exhortation, or exclamation, is not distinguished from the nominative except in nouns of the second declension, and in certain Greek words adopted by the classical writers. When a noun in *-us* has to be used in the vocative, the crude form is employed with the lightest substitution for the characteristic vowel. Thus *dominus* makes *domine*. If *i* precedes the characteristic, the vocative *e* is absorbed, and *filius* makes *fili* = *filie*. The same is the case with *meus* which has for its vocative *mi* = *mee*. As the regular nominative plural of *deus* is *di*, the Romans, to avoid confusion, did not use a vocative *dee* = *di*. This rule does not apply to adjectives, as *Cynthĭe* from *Cynthĭus*, *Sperchīe* from *Sperchīus*. The vocative *Cāī* exposes the common error of pronouncing the dactyl *Cāĭŭs* as a trochee; for if this had been true the vocative must have been *Cai-e*. In point of fact, *Caius* is scanned regularly in three syllables; thus we have (Martial, IX. *Ep.* 93):

v. 4. Pervigil in pluma *Cāĭŭs*, ecce, jacet.
v. 7. Quod debes, *Cāī*, redde, inquit Phœbus.
v. 10. *Cāĭŭs* et mallet verbera mille pati.
v. 12. Non mavis quam ter *Cāĭŭs* esse tuus.

Although the vocative, as a distinct case, is thus limited to a few forms in the language, the Latin writers give it occasionally a very remarkable extension of use. Thus it is made to agree with the nominative *tu:* as

> Stemmate quod Tusco ramum *millesime* ducis,
> Censoremne tuum vel quod *trabeate* salutas.
> (Pers. III. 27, 28).

This is regularly the case in the idiomatic use of *macte* = *magis aucte* (i. e. *frugibus et mola*); thus we have: *macte virtute esto*, "be increased in virtue" (Hor. I. *Serm.* II. 31); *macte novâ virtute puer*, "be increased in your young valour" (Virg. *Æn.* IX. 641). And even in an oblique sentence, as: *juberem* [*te*] *macte virtute esse* (Liv. II. 12).

§ 11. *Adverbs considered as Cases of Nouns.*

If now we add to the observations derived from the actual cases of nouns, the additional phenomena furnished by the adverbs, the subject of this chapter will have received all the examination of which it is capable.

Adverbs are, properly speaking, certain cases of pronouns and nouns, and under particular circumstances they are deduced from the participles or supines of verbs. Their syntactical use is as secondary predicates, inasmuch as they convey predication only through the verb of the sentence. The Greeks employ their adjectives and participles for this purpose without any additional inflexion; but the Roman adverbs are always cases, and sometimes, if one may use the expression, double or superimposed cases of nominal or pronominal forms.

Pronominal adverbs are secondary predicates either of place or of time. The former indicate—(*a*) "locality," in which case they generally exhibit the locative endings *-bi* and *-im* or the accusative *-m:* thus, from the demonstrative *is* and the relative *qui*, we have *i-bi* and *u-bi*, originally *cubi*, comp. *ali-cubi*, &c.; from *iste* we have *istim*, &c.; and the ending *-m* appears in *us-quam* or *uspiam*, &c.;—(*b*) "motion towards," in which case they end in *-o:* as *ul-tro*, "to a place beyond" (see Döderlein, *Syn. u. Etym.* III. pp. 105, sqq.); *quo*, "whither;" *eo*, "thither;" &c.; sometimes *-c* is appended: thus we have *illuc*, *istuc*, by the side of *illo*, *isto;*—(*c*) "motion from," in which case the ending is *-nde*, or *-nce*, *-nque:* thus we have *i-nde* from *is*, [*c*]*u-nde* from *qui*, *aliu-nde* from *alius*, *hi-nc* from *hi-c*, *illi-nc* from *ille*, *utri-nque* from *uter;*—(*d*) "the way," in which case we have a feminine ablative in *-â* agreeing with *viâ* understood, as *quâ*, *eâ*, &c. The forms of class (*c*) deserve some special remark. The comparison of *tum* with *tunc* shows that the *n* would have been written *m*, if the *c* had not been appended. And the same remark applies to *exin-de*, *hin-c*, *illin-c*, *istin-c:* for *exim* occurs in Lucretius, (see Lachmann on III. 161), and Ritschl has claimed *illim* and *istim* for the text of Plautus (*Rhein. Mus.* 1850. pp. 472, sqq.). But this does not interfere with the inference that the accusative and locative *m* is the representative of an original dental. There can be no doubt that the termination *-de* is identical with that of the ablative, and, as we have seen, with the termination *-tus*. Bopp, who was aware

of this (*Vergl. Gramm.* p. 610), proposes to consider the same letter as included in *hinc, illinc, istinc,* which he regards as corruptions of *hindc, illindc, istindc.* I should not desire any other proof of the importance of the distinction which I first introduced into the analysis of the pronominal elements (*New Crat.* § 130). According to the principle which regulates all combinations of these elements, $n + c$ denotes motion "from the *there* to the *here*," and therefore expresses ablation or removal quite as naturally as the affix *-de* = *-tus,* which is in fact ultimately referable to the same source (*N. Crat.* § 262).

Pronominal adverbs of time generally end in *-m,* as *tum, quum;* in *-nc, -nque,* as *tu-nc, cu-nque;* or in *-ndo, -nquam,* as *qua-ndo, nu-nquam.*

Adverbs derived from nouns adjective and substantive either end in *e, o,* or *ter;* or else they are merely adjectives in the neuter objective case.

(*a*) Adverbs in *e* or *o,* anciently ending in *-ed,* or *-od,* are, in fact, ablative cases of adjectives: thus *valde,* originally *validod; bene,* originally *bonod; cito,* originally *citod; certe* or *certo,* originally *certod,* &c., are the ablative cases of *validus, bonus, citus, certus,* &c. respectively. The Greeks had a large class of adverbs of the same kind; but in these the final *-d* of the ablative has been softened down, according to the laws of Hellenism, into an *-ς*: thus, *οὕτως, καλῶς,* &c. represent the old forms of the ablative, *οὕτοδ, καλόδ,* &c. (see *N. Crat.* § 249). There are two cases where this *δ-* seems still to exist, *ἴδ-ιος* and *Ἀφροδ-ίτη* (Sanscr. *Abhrâd-itâ*); and there is one instance in which the metre of Homer will not allow its modern representative to stand, namely, in those passages where *ἕως* is a trochee. The Sanscrit *tâ-vat* compared with *τέϝως* might justify the supposition that the original form was *ἄϝοδ*; while the analogy of *λαϝός, λέϝως, νάος, νέως,* should authorise us to insert, even in our Hellenic text of Homer, the emendation *ἆϝος* for *ἕως* (comp. also *Ἥως, Αὔως, Ἔως*), whenever this particle is a trochee[1].

---

[1] There can be little doubt that *ἕως* and *τέως* correspond to *yâvat* and *tâvat* respectively. Now as, by the side of *λέως,* we have *λαϝός* and *λᾶς,* so by the side of *ἕως* we have *ἆς* (Pind. *O.* XI. 51; Aristoph. *Lysistr.* 173), which was also written *ϝᾶς* (*Tab. Heracl.* 2, 52, p. 207); and we may therefore infer the intermediate form *ἆϝος* = *ἆϝοδ* = *yâ-vat.*

(*b*) The termination *-ter* is appended to adjectives of the third declension in the same way as $\left.\begin{matrix}-\bar{o}\\-\bar{e}\end{matrix}\right\}[d]$ is affixed to adjectives of the first and second declension. Thus, from *lenis* we have *leni-ter;* from *gravis, gravi-ter;* from *felix, felici-ter;* from *audax, audac-ter;* from *difficilis, difficul-ter;* and so on. To these must be added the isolated form *igi-tur*, which, according to Festus, (p. 105, Müller) is equivalent to *inde, postea, tum* (above, p. 204). The first two syllables *i-gi* must be taken to represent the composite forms *e-go, e-ho, e-ja*, &c.: and as the Umbrian *es-te* represents the Latin *i-ta*, so *i-gi-* may correspond to *es-ga=er-ga*, which is strictly a synonym of *i-gi-tur*. The termination *-ter, -tur*, is, in fact, the same as *-tus*, which is appended to substantives and adjectives of the second declension: thus we have *cœli-tus, fundi-tus, radici-tus, antiqui-tus, divini-tus, humani-tus*, &c. This last, which is obviously the older form, answers to the Sanscrit *-tas, -thas, -das, -dhas*, on the one hand, and to the Greek *-θεν* on the other (compare the Greek first person plural in *-μεν* with the Latin in *-mus*). There is yet a third form in which it appears, namely, *-tim*, which is the termination of a most interesting class of participial adverbs; for I cannot consent to consider any of them as strictly formed from nouns; and though the verbs in all cases are not forthcoming, the adverbs themselves prove that they must have existed in part at least. Instances of this class of adverbs are *caterva-tim, carp-tim, grada-tim, priva-tim, punc-tim, separa-tim, vica-tim*. Compare with these the German participial forms in *-ingen*, and the Greek participial adverbs in *-νδα, -νδην, -δην* (*N. Crat.* § 263). The most striking result from a proper appreciation of the origin of adverbs in *-tim*, is the explanation which it supplies for those adverbs in *-ter* which are derived from active participles. The termination of the supine is already *-tu;* the adverb, therefore, is a locative case of the supine; for *caterva-tim* stands to *caterva-tus* in precisely the same relation as *par-tim* to *pars* (*par*[*t*]*s*). Similarly, *aman-ter, sapien-ter*, &c. are cases of the participles *amans, sapiens*, &c.; for the crude forms of these participles already contain the *t*. Now, if I am right in concluding that these terminations, *-θεν, -dhas, -ter, -tus, -tim*, &c. are lengthened forms of that dental affix which marks the ablative of the noun, most interesting conclusions

may be drawn from this respecting the origin of the participle and of the passive person-endings of the Latin verb: for if the dental, which must be added to the noun to form the ablative case or adverb, is already included in the participle, it follows that the crude form of the participle is already an ablative formation. That there is no essential distinction between the terminations *-tim* and *-ter*, and that the former is not restricted to participles of the passive formation, is clear from such forms as *pede-tentim*, &c. In fact, while the *-d* or *-t* alone are sufficient to express the ablative and participial relation (as in *cupi-dus=cupiens;* the terminations *-δον, -δην*, by the side of *-νδον, -νδην*; the participle *τετυφότ*[*-ως*] by the side of *τύπτοντ-*; and the adverbs in *-tus* by the side of those in *-nde*, both signifying "motion from"= "ablation"), yet we must admit that the strengthened form of the active participle, which contains the liquid as well as the mute dental, is no less ablative than those forms in which the mute appears alone; for there is no less opposition between *i-bi* and *i-nde* from *i-s*, than between *αὐτό-θι* and *αὐτό-θεν* from *αὐτό-ς*[1]. The participle, therefore, is an ablative or adverbial formation from a verbal root, expressing that which comes out of the action of a verb, *i. e.* the manner of it; and differs only from these adverbs, and from the persons of the verb, in the circumstance, that it is not an immoveable form, but one which is capable of regular flexion through the whole system of cases (*N. Crat.* §§ 300, 415).

Adverbs, used as conjunctions, are such as *jam* (from *is*), *enim* (Sanscr. *ênа*), *ideo*, *tamen*, *igitur*, &c. These are, in fact, cases of different pronouns. Most of them are of obvious origin:

---

[1] In the text I have merely put together some of the analogies suggested in my former work. The late Mr. Garnett, who was one of the soundest, and, at the same time, most original philologers in this country, had arrived at some results which were calculated to confirm and extend these views. In a letter to me (dated 3d May, 1842) he said: "I flatter myself that I can make it appear from a pretty copious induction that the Indo-Germanic present participle is formed upon the ablative case of the verbal noun [Sanscrit *tupat*], in much the same way as the pronoun possessive in Latin, German, &c., is formed upon the genitive of the personal. If I am not mistaken, this is calculated to throw an important light upon the organization of the Indo-Germanic and many other languages."

ideo (comp. *adeo*) is equivalent to the Greek ἐπίτηδες (= ἐπὶ τάδεσιν, Buttmann), and from it is derived *idoneus* = *ideoneus* = Gr. ἐπιτήδειος. *Igitur* is either the case in *-tur* (= *tus*, -θεν) from a pronoun which is found in Oscan, under the form of *eśa*, the soft Latin *g* representing the sound of *ś* or *z*, or it is the locative of the third pronoun strengthened by a prefix equivalent to the combination *e-ho*, *e-go*, which is found with similar adjuncts, especially in the case of *i-s-te*, the first syllable of which includes the same elements as *i-gi*, and *e-ho*. In old Latin its signification was *i-nde*, "out of that" (Festus, p. 105; above, Chapter. VI. § 7), which is the usual force of the termination *-tus* = θεν, or "thereupon," which agrees with the other analysis of *igitur*, with the use of *-tur* in the third person passive, and with the obvious meaning of *e-s-te* in Umbrian.

Some adverbs are merely cases of common nouns, which usage has made indeclinable. These appear sometimes as conjunctions, and sometimes as prepositions. *Instar*, *gratiâ*, and *ergo*, may be compared with δίκην, χάριν, and ἕνεκα (see *New Crat.* §§ 271, sqq.). *Prope*[*d*] (cf. *propin-quus*) is the ablative of an old adjective, and *prop-ter* is its case in *-ter* = *tus* = θεν. *Penes* and *tenus* are forms of the same kind as *instar*, and contain the roots of *pen-dere*, *ten-dere*. *Clam* and *palam* are locatives of the same nature as *partim*, &c. The former, which was also written *calim* (Fest. p. 47), contains the root of *celo*, κλέπτω, καλύπτω, &c. *Palam* is the same case of an adjective connected with *palatum*, πύλη, &c. That it is a noun appears farther from the fact, that it is used also with the preposition *in* (*in palam* = *aperte*, *Gloss. Isid.*), like *in-cassum*; comp. *propalam*. The same is the case with *coram* = *co'oram* (κατ' ὄμμα); comp. *co'minus*, *e'minus* (ἐκ χειρός). Sometimes the adverb is merely the crude form of the noun. We have examples of this in *simul*, *procul* (from *similis*, *procilis*); and the ancients wrote *facul* (Fest. p. 87) and *perfacul* (id. p. 214) for *faculter* or *facile*, and *perfacile*. Again, the full form of the noun is occasionally used as an adverb: in the XII. Tables we have *nox* for *noctu* (above, p. 216); and Virgil (*Æn.* I. 215; VII. 624) and other writers use *pars* for *partim*. There is an approximation to this usage in the indeclinable Greek θέμις (Buttmann, *Ausf. Sprachl.* I. p. 227).

§ 12. *Adverbial expression for the day of the month.*

To these instances of the adverbial use of nouns may, perhaps, be added the phrase by which the Romans designated the day of the month. Here a locative of the day is inserted between the preposition and the word which denotes the standard of reckoning. Thus, "on the fourth day before the Nones of April," is expressed by, *ante* (*die quarto*) *Nonas Apriles* = *quarto die ante Nonas Apriles.* And this whole expression is regarded as one word, which may be dependent on a preposition: thus we may say, *ex ante die* iii. *Non. Jun. usque ad pridie Kal. Septembres,* or *differre aliquid in ante* xv. *Kal. Novembres.*

If the inserted date was ever written or pronounced in the accusative case, according to the ordinary practice among modern Latinists, it is obvious that this must have originated in an attraction, or in a mistaken usage. The well-known employment of the locative *pridie* to indicate the day immediately before the Calends, Nones, or Ides, shows that the other days must have been expressed in the same case.

CHAPTER IX.

DECLENSIONS OF THE LATIN NOUN.

§ 1. The usual arrangement is erroneous. § 2. General rules for the classification of Latin nouns. § 3. First or *-a* declension. § 4. Second or *-o* declension. § 5. Third declension or consonantal nouns. § 6. A. First class or purely consonantal nouns. § 7. B. Second class or semi-consonantal nouns.

§ 1. *The usual Arrangement is erroneous.*

THE arrangement of Latin nouns in different declensions (κλίσεις) or forms of inflexion has been managed by grammarians without any regard either to the internal organization of the word or to the real convenience of the learner. Among the ancient grammarians, Varro proposed a simple convention—namely, to distinguish the declensions of nouns according to the vowel of the ablative singular (*L. L.* X. 62, p. 257, Müller): "nam ejus cassuis literarum discriminibus facilius reliquorum varietatem discernere poterit, quod ei habent exitus, aut in A, ut *hac terrâ;* aut in E ut *hac lance;* aut in I, ut *hac levi;* aut in O, ut *hoc cœlo;* aut in U, ut *hoc versu.* Igitur ad demonstrandas declinationes vice prima hæc." Diomedes distinguished seven declensions, dividing the nouns in *-ius, -ium* from those in *-us, -um,* and the neuters in *-u* from the feminines in *-us* (see *Zeitschr. f. d. Wiss. d. Spr.* III. 315). The favourite and oldest method in this country has been to consider the noun according to five distinct declensions. The *a* and *o* declensions stand in their proper place at the head of the list. Then follows the consonantal declension considered as one. And the nouns in *-u* and *-e* are treated as two distinct schemes of case-formations. One of the objects, which I proposed to myself in writing a new Latin Grammar, was to correct this vicious and faulty exhibition of the different forms of the noun; but I was unable in that elementary treatise[1] to explain and justify every feature in the new system which I adopted. That and other developments were reserved for the present work; and I shall now proceed to show that the arrangement, which appears in the Latin Grammar, is the only classification which is consistent with the results of scientific phi-

[1] *A complete Latin Grammar for the use of learners.* London, 1852.

lology; while I know by experience that it is at least as easy to the learner.

§ 2. *General rules for the classification of Latin Nouns.*

The true classification of the crude or uninflected forms of the Latin noun is obviously that of the letters which constitute the distinctive characteristics. At first sight, all these forms fall into two great divisions, according as they terminate in vowels or consonants. But while, on the one hand, the vowels themselves are distinguished by their structure and origin as vowels of articulation and vocalized consonants, so that the latter belong to the consonant class when considered according to the genesis of the crude form,—on the other hand, the consonants are not less distinguished among themselves, according to the organ by which they are uttered, and according to the difference between mutes and liquids, than they are discriminated from the pure vowels. The scientific or methodical order of the declensions must be one which enables us most easily to fall back on the root of the noun, and on the original form of those pronominal affixes by which it is extended or developed, before it becomes the vehicle of the case-endings. And if the vocalized consonants *i* and *u* may be traced to an ultimate identity with guttural or labial mutes, it is clear that the nouns of which they are the characteristics ought to be ranged among the consonant declensions. In this way, we shall have two main classes of nouns—those whose characteristic is one of the pure vowels *a* or *o*, and these may be considered as subdivided into two declensions;—and those whose characteristic is a consonant, whether mute, or liquid, or one of the semi-consonants *i* and *u*, considered as a representative of some mute, and these may be regarded as constituting one declension. While this scheme of the declensions is the only arrangement, which can be justified on the grounds of scientific etymology, it is at least as convenient as any other to the mere learner: for we cannot give any practical rule to a beginner more simple than that which results from this arrangement—namely, that the vowel-nouns invariably form their genitive plural in *-a-rum* or *-o-rum*, which is rarely contracted into *-ûm;* that they form their dative and ablative plural in *-is*, which rarely appears under the uncontracted form *-bus;* that the accusative singular is always *-am* or *-um*, the accusative

plural *-os* or *-as*, and the ablative singular always *-â* or *-ô*; and, on the other hand, that the consonant nouns generally form their genitive plural in *-um*, which is rarely preceded by the characteristic *r*; that, conversely, they form their dative and ablative plural in *-bus*, which rarely, if ever, loses its characteristic *b*; that the ablative singular is always *e* or *i*; and the accusative plural always *-es*, except when the characteristic is *u*. These general distinctions do not apply to the nominative-accusative plural of neuter nouns, which are uniformly terminated by *-ă* in all declensions. If then the classification, which I am about to explain, is not only true, but most convenient to the student, there can be no reason why it should not supersede the old-fashioned method even in elementary grammars.

§ 3. *First or -a Declension.*

The Latin *-a* declension, as compared with the Greek, presents one remarkable contrast. In pure Latin nouns, the termination is invariably *-ă*, whereas in corresponding forms the Greek declension exhibits *-ă*, *-ā*, *-ās*, *-η*, *-ης*. Thus we have not only *cellă* by the side of ἄμιλλᾰ, but *amicitiă*, *scribă*, *areă*, *notă*, *homicidă*, by the side of φιλίᾱ, ταμίᾱς, συκέᾱ, τρίβη, ἀνδρειφόντης. And even when Greek nouns are transplanted, the same shortening of the last syllable may take place; thus πέτρᾱ and ζώνη become *petră* and *zonă*. The explanation of this phenomenon is to be sought in the general tendency to abbreviation, which characterizes the Latin language, and which is perhaps connected with their habit of throwing the accent forward. In many cases the short *ă* is not merely an extenuation of the syllable, but an abridgment involving the omission of one or more formative letters. Thus, as φιλίᾱ must be considered as a contraction of φιλί-α-σᾰ, the same omission must have taken place in *amicitia*, and we shall see a farther proof of this when we come to the nouns in *-ēs* = *-ă-ĭs*. A comparison of κριτής, συκέα, *-ῆ*, and ταμίας, shows us that these words involve the second pronominal element under the form *ia* = *ya*. And we must presume an addition of the same element in *scrib-a* = *scrib-yas*, *not-ă* = *not-yasa*, *homicīd-a* = *homicid-yas*, &c. The length of the *ā* in *familiās* = *familiais*, *familiâ* = *familiad*, *filiābus* = *filia-ibus*, *filiās* = *filiam-s* is of course due to the absorption, in each case, of some original letter, so recently belonging to the inflexion that it could not be forgotten.

§ 4. *Second or -o Declension.*

As the nominative of this declension ends in *-us* or *-er* = *-rus*, and the accusative in *-um*, it is necessary to state to the beginner why the characteristic is said to be *o* and not *u*: but to any one who has made even a commencement in philology, it is obvious that while the forms in *-ō*, *-ōrum*, *-ōs* could not have sprung from an original *u*, the forms, in which a short *ŭ* appears, would naturally result from a short *ŏ* (above, Ch. VII. § 5). Besides, many of these nouns appear by the side of Greek nouns in *-os*, and in old Latin the *o* is still apparent, as in *quom* for *quum*, *oloes* for *ollis* or *illis*, &c. A comparison of *ager* with ἄγρος, *Alexander* with Ἀλέξανδρος, and the like, shows that the Latin forms have suffered an apocope not altogether unlike that of *scriba* from *scribyas*, &c., and certainly due to the same tendency to abbreviate and throw back the accent. We have nouns in *-erus* which are never shortened into *-er*, as *humerus*, *numerus*, *vesperus*, *uterus*; and some compounds with the verb-roots *fer-* and *ger-* present both the full form and the apocope; thus we have *armiger* by the side of *morigerus*. In these instances, of course, the *er* is retained throughout the declension. But in the oblique cases of *ager* and *Alexander*, as in the corresponding Greek words, the *e* is dropt, as might have been expected from its obvious functions as a merely compensatory insertion. The same is the case with a great many words of this form, especially those which exhibit the termination signifying agency, which corresponds to the Greek *-της*, *-τηρ*, *-τωρ*, from *-τρια*, *-τριδ-*, such as *magis-ter*, *minis-ter*, *arbi-ter*, &c. There is also in Latin a longer form in *-tor*, *-toris*. Those which retain the *e* have generally some Greek affinity, which explains the importance of the letter. Thus *puer* must be compared with the Greek ποῖρ: *līber*, *līberi* = ἐλεύθερος or Διόννσος ἐλευθέριος, is thus distinguished from *lĭ-ber*, *li-bri*; *gener*, *generi* belongs to γένος, γενε[σ]ος, *genus*, *generis*, and *socer* to ἔκυρος. It is to be observed that although *ager* always loses its *e* in the oblique cases, this unessential letter is constantly retained in the compound *jugerum* = *diagerum* (above, p. 269).

§ 5. *Third Declension or consonantal Nouns.*

It has been already remarked, that nouns of the third declension are arranged according to the nature of the characteristic

consonant, which precedes the case-ending; and that they fall into two great classes according as they retain the consonant or vocalize it into *i* or *a*. The characteristic is very often lost in the nominative singular, but it may always be recovered by a careful examination of the oblique cases.

§ 6. A. *First class or purely consonantal Nouns.*

(*a*) Labial nouns are limited to some few in *b*, as *plebs* (also *plebes*), *scobs* (also *scobis*), *scrobs* (also *scrobis*), *trabs*, *urbs* (anciently *urbis?*), and some few in *p*, as *daps*, *stips*, *stirps* (anciently *stirpis?*), to which must be added compounds in *cip-* from *capio*, as *man-ceps*, *muni-ceps*, *parti-ceps*, *prin-ceps*. To the same class of compounds we must refer *for-ceps*, "a pair of pincers," the first syllable referring to the "opening" or "door," which this instrument makes in order to grasp the object. Similarly we have *for-fex*, "a pair of scissors," from *facio*, and *for-pex*, "a pair of curling-tongs," from *pec-to*.

(*b*) Guttural nouns are a more numerous group, and the tenuis *c* is a more common characteristic than the medial *g*. Of the latter class we have only the primitive *frūx* (*frūg-*), *grex* (*grĕg-*), and *strix* (*strĭg-*): and the verbals *lex* (root *leg-*), *rex* (root *reg-*), with the compounds *il-lex*, *inter-rex*, *con-jux* (root *jug-*), *remex* (root *ag-*). *Supellex* is an abridgment of the form in *-li-* indicated by the genitive *supellectilis*, and the *x* does not represent a *g* but *cts*. The same is the case with *senex* (= ἄναξ), which conversely exhibits a shortened form in its genitive *senis:* cf., however, *senectus*, *seneca*, *senecio*, &c. In *nix* the *x* represents *gv* or *qv:* cf. *ninguo*. The genitive *nĭvis* may be compared with *vīvo* = *qviqvo*, *strŭo* = *struquo*, &c. The tenuis *c* is the characteristic of a number of primitive nouns, such as *fax* (*făc-*), *lux* (*lūc-*), *codex* (*codic-*), *cornix* (*cornīc-*), &c.; it also appears in nouns containing the root of *c* verbs, as *dux* (*dŭc-*), *ju-dex* (*dĭc-*), and other nouns from *dico;* *pol-lex* (*lĭc-*), and other nouns from *licio;* *arti-fex* (*fĭc-*), and other nouns from *facio;* and we find a great number of feminines in *-trix* corresponding to real or possible masculines in *tor*, such as *nutrix* (*nutrīc-*), *obstetrix* (*obstetrīc-*), &c. The last word deserves some special notice, as showing the true meaning of *ob* in composition. For *ob-stetrix* must mean "a woman who stands by to assist"—a *Beisteherin*—and παραστῆναι or συμπαρα-

στῆναι is especially used to denote this *by-standing* or *as-sistance* in childbirth: so Pind. *Ol.* VI. 42: πραΰμητίν τ' Ἐλευθὼ συμπαρέστασέν τε Μοίρας. cf. *Ol.* XI. 54. If then *ob-sto* may signify "to assist," like παρίστημι, as well as "to oppose," it can only bear this meaning in consequence of the sense of extension, continuance, and perseverance borne by *ob;* and thus *of-ficium* may denote "beneficial aid," though *of-ficio* signifies harm and hinderance. Compare the two applications of our word *pre-vent,* which means to go before, either for the purpose of clearing the way, or for the purpose of obstructing the passage. From this explanation of *ob-stetr-ix,* it is plain that *Stator* does not imply, actively, "one who causes to stand," but "one who stands by, ready to help"—*qui stat opem laturus*—of a *præsens Divus,* according to the proper meaning of that term, as in Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* I. 12. § 28: "Hercules *tantus* et *tam præsens* habetur deus."

(*c*) The most numerous and important class of the purely consonantal nouns are those which have a dental mute for their characteristic; for while the labial and guttural nouns are limited to the masculine and feminine, these exhibit also some neuter nouns of very common occurrence. (*a*) Masculine and feminine nouns in *-d* are such as *pes* (*pĕd-*), *frons* (*frond-*), *vas* (*vād-*)[1], and its derivatives *præs* (=*præ-vad-*), *custos* (*custo-vad-*), and *mercēs* (*merce-vad-*); *palus* (*palūd-*), &c. Masculine and feminine nouns in *-t,* are such as *dens* (*dent-*), *frons* (*front-*), *pars* (*part-*), *comes* (*comĭt-*), *quies* (*quiēt-*), *nepos* (*nepōt-*); a very long list of abstract words in *-tas* (*-tat-*), as *boni-tas,* with a smaller number of supplementary forms in *-tus* (*-tut-*), as *vir-tus;* and active participles in *-ns* (*-nt-*), which are occasionally used as nouns, as *serpens* (*serpent-*), &c. The genitive plural in *-ium* would lead us to infer that these must have been originally older forms in *-tis* of those nouns in *-t,* in which the characteristic is preceded by another consonant; cf. *scobs* with *scobis,* and *dens,* gen. pl. *dentium,* with *sementis.*

---

[1] This word is interesting from its connexion with the Low-German *wæd,* or *wad,* "a pledge," found in *wad-set, wed-ding, &c.* Another form was *bad,* as in the old compact *gif bad genumen sy on monnes orfe,* "if a pledge be taken from a man's chattels;" and from this comes out *bet.* From the Low Latin *vad-iare* comes the Romance *guadiare, guaggiare,* and our *wager.* (See Palgrave, *History of the Anglo-Saxons,* Pref. p. xxi.)

(β) Neuter nouns of this class originally and properly terminated in *-t*. Although *caput*, gen. *capitis* (for which the oldest MSS. of Lucretius give *capud*), is the only word in which the characteristic is retained unaltered, Greek analogies and many collateral indications enable us to see at once what nouns belonged to this dental declension. Some Greek nouns in *-μα=ματ-=μεντ-* (*New Crat.* § 114) have been naturalized in Latin, such as *poema*, gen. *poematis;* and *lac*, gen. *lactis*, retains more of the termination in the nominative than the corresponding γάλα, gen. γάλακτος. The τ, which is lost in κέαρ, *cor*, is represented by the medial in καρδία, *cordis*. And though *carmen* (cf. *carmentis*), *agmen* (cf. *armentum*), have omitted the characteristic *t*, not only in the nominative, but also in the oblique cases *carminis, agminis*, &c., they at all events retain the preceding liquid, which is lost altogether in the Greek neuters in *-μα, -ματος*. And while *corpus, opus*, &c. agree with τεῖχος in softening the τ into ς, they retain some trace of it in the *r* of the oblique cases, where the Greek, according to the rule (*New Crat.* § 114), has dropt the ς between the two vowels. There is an assimilation of the *t* in the oblique cases of *os, oss-is* (cf. ὄστ-εον), *mel, mellis* (cf. μέλι-τ), *fel, fellis*, and *far, farris*. The singular forms *jecur* (also *jecinor*), *iter* (also *itiner*), and *jubar*, probably ended originally in *-rat*, like the Greek ἦπαρ for ἤπρατ, gen. ἥπατος. The following table will show the gradual degeneration of the forms:

α	β_1	β_2	β_3	β_4	*γ*
caput	*lac*[*t*]	*cor*	*os*[*t*]	*carmen*[*t*]	*corpus*
capit-is	*lact-is*	*cord-is*	*oss-is*	*carmin-is*	*corpor-is.*

Here it will be observed that in *α* the *t* is preserved intact; that in β_1 it is lost after another consonant in the nominative, and preserved in the oblique cases; that in β_2 it is retained in the medial form which comes nearer to the preceding liquid *r* (above, p. 256); that in β_3 it is assimilated to *s;* that in β_4 it is altogether dropt after *n;* and that in *γ* it is softened into *s* and *r*. In comparing *corpus, corpor-is*, with τεῖχος, τείχε-ος, we observe that although the latter has lost the σ, according to the rule, because it is flanked by two vowels, it could retain the neuter characteristic before a consonant: thus we have ὀρέσ-βιος from ὄρος, σακεσ-πάλος from σάκος, &c. Similarly, that

the *r* or *s* which takes the place of *t* in the Latin nouns, is retained in derivatives, like *gener-osus*, from *genus, generis*, *robus-tus* from *robur*, and *tempes-tas* from *tempus*.

(*d*) Liquid nouns are generally of dental origin, and many of them recal to our recollection the neuter nouns, which have just been mentioned. The only noun in *m* is the word *hiem-s*, gen. *hiemis*, which is probably the corruption of a longer form in *mn:* cf. χείμων and χεῖμα=χείμεντ. There are a few nouns in *l*, as *sol, sōl-is, sāl, sălis* (which is neuter, as well as masculine, and which, in that use, has lost a final *t*), *nihil* (for *nihilum*), which is neuter and undeclined, and some compounds derived from *salio*, as *con-sul, præ-sul, ex-sul.* The great majority of liquid nouns have crude forms in *n* or *r=s.* Of the former we have some in *-o, -ĭnis;* many in *-do, -ēdo, -īdo, -tūdo,* of which the genitive is formed in *-dĭnis,* &c.; others in *-go, -āgo, -īgo, -ūgo,* which have their genitives in *-gĭnis,* &c.; others, again, in *-o, -io, -mo, -sio, -tio,* which form the genitive in *-ōnis,* &c. It is superfluous to give examples of all these different classes. In comparing *caro*, gen. *carnis*, with *virgo*, gen. *virgĭnis*, we see that two liquids in the former have coalesced to the exclusion of the short *ĭ;* and *virgo=virgĭn-s* differs from *sermo=sermôn-s*, just as δαίμων=δαίμον-ς differs from χείμων=χείμων-ς, or as ποίμην=ποίμεν-ς differs from σπλήν=σπλήν-ς. In some of the nouns in *s=r* this characteristic represents the neuter *t;* such are *æs*, gen. *æris, rus*, gen. *rūris, os*, gen. *oris, ver*, gen. *veris*, &c. Other nouns in *r* really belong to the *i* declension, as *laquear*, gen. *laqueāris.* But we have a large number of masculine and feminine nouns of which *r* is the genuine characteristic. These are formed in *-ĕr*, or *-es*, or *-us, -ĕris*, as *mulier, Ceres, Venus;* in *-ōr* or *-os, -oris*, as *labor, flos;* in *-ur, -ŭris*, as *augur;* in *-ūr = -us, -uris*, as *tellus;* in *-or, -ŏris*, as *arbor:* we have an important class of nouns denoting agency, and ending in *-ter, -tris*, as *pa-ter, ma-ter*, &c., to which must be added *u-ter, u-tris, ven-ter, ven-tris*, and the compound *ac-cipi-ter* (*-tris*) from *accipio:* cf. *capys*, the Etruscan word for a falcon (above, p. 155). The instrumental ending in *-ter* is extended, in a very numerous class of nouns, to *-tor, -toris*, assibilated to *-sor, -sōris;* thus we have *duc-tor* from *duc-o, ara-tor* from *aro, moni-tor* from *moneo, spon-sor* from *spondeo*, &c. We have seen that the *r* often appears as *s* in the nominative; in two nouns an *e* is changed

into *i* in this case;—thus we have *cinis, cinĕris* and *pulvis, pulvĕris.* In consonantal derivatives from nouns in *r*, as in the corresponding neuter-forms, this characteristic is retained as a simple sibilant; thus, from *Venus, Venĕris* we have *venus-tas;* from *honor, honōris, hones-tas;* from *arbor, arbŏris, arbus-tum;* &c.

§ 7. B. *Second class or semi-consonantal Nouns.*

(*a*) Nouns in *i* exhibit some phenomena of considerable linguistic importance, which have eluded the observation of all previous grammarians. It has been shown elsewhere that the termination *i*, as a guttural residuum, is derived from the second pronominal element. But it appears as an extension not only of other pronominal affixes, but even of the second pronoun in many of its forms, and especially under the form *c=k.* Thus we have not only a large class of Greek adjectives in *-κός*, and nouns in *-κ-ς*, but we have also the extensions *-κ-ις*, *-κ-εος*, &c., in which that element is repeated under a softened or vocalized form. Similarly in Latin, although the nouns in *x = c-s* or *g-s* form their genitive plural in *-um* and are therefore independent of any additional elements, adjectives of the same form show by their ablative in *-i* and their genitive plural in *-ium*, that the full ending of the crude form is not *c-*, but *c-i.* It has been already remarked that some nouns in *b-* or *p-* have by-forms in *-bi-* or *-pi-*, and that nouns in *-nt-* must have been originally formed in *-nti-*. The last phenomenon connects itself with a very interesting fact—namely, that forms in *-nts* in Greek and Latin stand beside forms in *-ntus* and *-ndus.* From the regular change of *-ντς* in Greek into *-ntus* in Latin—as when we have *πᾶς = πάντ-ς* by the side of *quantus*, or *Τάρας = Τάραντ-ς* by the side of *Tarentum*—no inference can be drawn. But as *-d-* is generally, if not always, a shortened form of the articulation which appears as the second personal pronoun and the second numeral, and as we have verbal forms in *-dus* (as *cupidus*, &c.) by the side of verbals in *-τέος*, *-τύς*, *-τις*, it is not unreasonable to conclude that if *orien-t-s = oriu-n-dus*, the former is an abridgment of *orien-tis* analogous to *sementis*, &c., and this explains the genitive plural in *-ium.* Although there are some nouns in *-i-* which retain their characteristic throughout the cases—as *sitis, Tiberis, febris, puppis*, &c.,—it not unfrequently happens that the shorter

vowel *e* is substituted in the nom., acc. and abl. sing., and this is always the rule in the nom. and acc. pl. So that, generally, the criterion of a noun in *i* is furnished by the form of the gen. pl. Thus, although we have *nubes, nubem, nube, nubes*, we have always *nub-i-um.* The peculiar nouns in *-es = -a-is*, in which this characteristic *i* is appended to a crude form in *-ă*, sometimes appearing as a distinct noun of the first declension (cf. *mater-ia*, "the mother-stuff," or "materials," ὕλη, with *materies = materia-is*), always retain this *ê = ai*, and consequently exhibit the full or proper form of the gen. pl. in *-rum.* For, according to the rule, *s = r* is not usually elided except between two short vowels, and the contraction *ê = ai* produces the same result as the contractions *â = a-e* and *ô = ŏ-ĕ* in the first and second declension, so that we have *arum = a-erum, orum = o-erum* and *erum = a-irum.* As *canis, juvenis* and *vates* form the gen. pl. in *-um*, we infer from this simple fact that they are as improperly included in the *-i-* declension as other nouns are excluded from it. If we compare *canis* with κύων = κύον-ς, we shall see that the *i* is merely an unorganic insertion after the liquid, and the same is the case with *juvenis;* whereas *vates* must be explained on the same principle as the Greek compounds in *-ης* from neuter nouns in *-ος*, which exhibit the lengthened form only in the nom. and accus. (*New Crat.* § 228). The neuter nouns in *-e*, which are shown by their abl. sing. in *-i*, their nom. accus. pl. in *-ia*, and their gen. pl. in *-ium*, to belong to the class of *-i* nouns, are really the neuter forms of adjectives in *-is.* Compare, for example, *mœnia* with *com-munis, mare* and *mille* with *acris, agilis, rete* with *restis* and *irretire, animal*, for *animale*, with *æqualis*, &c. One of the strongest proofs that the additional *-i* is an indication of the adjectival inflexion is furnished by the fact that while the immoveable *vetus, veteris*, forms its gen. pl. in *-um*, and while *celer*, denoting "a horseman," has no gen. pl. but *celerum*, the regularly inflected adjective *celer, celeris, celere*, has a gen. pl. *celer-ium.* With regard to the nouns in *l* and *r* in particular, we must consider that the extensions in *-lis* and *-ris* are the basis of further extension in *-leus* and *-rius*, such as *nuc-leus, prætorius*, &c., which in Greek would sometimes appear as *-λι-κος*, and for this there is an occasional parallel in Latin, as in *fame-li-cus.* The following classification will show how far the whole group of *i* nouns has retained or lost the original characteristic.

	pupp-is	*nube[=i]s*	*urb[i]s*	*serpen[ti]s*	*diê[=a-i]s*	*mar[ĭ=]e* *animal[ĭ]*
	pupp-is	....	....	....	....	*mar-is* *animal-is*
Abl.	*pupp-i*	....	....	....	....	*mar-i* *animal-i*
	pupp-im or *em*	....	....	....	....	N.A. pl. *mar-ia* *animal-ia*
pl.	*pupp-ium*	*nub-ium*	*urb-ium*	*serpen-t-ium*	*diê[=a-i]-r-um*	*mar-ium* *animal-ium*

(*β*) There can be little doubt that nouns in *u* either included or were ultimately identical with the nouns in *-i*, which have just been discussed. Thus in Greek *-υ-ς* was originally *-Fις* or *-υις*, and the Oscan *Ke-us* stands by the side of the Latin *ci-vis* (above, p. 125). In most existing instances, however, this *i* has been lost, and we have either a noun in *v*, declined like the purely consonant nouns, or a form in which the *u* is retained throughout, just as the *i* alone keeps its place in the most regular of the *i* nouns. Of the former class, we have only two remaining: *bos*, for *bov-s* (Greek *βοῦς*), gen. *bov-is*, and *Jus* for *Jov-s* (Greek *Ζεύς*), gen. *Jov-is*. The nominative of this latter noun is always connected with *pater* under the form *Ju-piter*, corresponding more nearly to the Greek vocative. Thus Catullus (LXIV. [LXVI.], 48) translates the line of Callimachus word for word as follows:

Ζεῦ πάτερ ὡς Χαλύβων πᾶν ἀπόλοιτο γένος.
Ju-piter ut Chalybôn omne genus pereat.

The analogy between the nouns in *i* and *u* will be seen from the following comparison.

N.	*pupp-is*	*trib-us*	N. A.	*ret[i=]e*	*corn-u*
G.	*pupp-is*	*trib-ûs*	G.	*ret-is*	*corn-us*
D.	*pupp-i*	*tribu-i* or *tribû*	D.	*ret-i*	*corn-u*
A.	*pupp-im*	*trib-um*	N. pl.	*ret-ia*	*corn-ua*
Abl.	*pupp-i*	*trib-u*	G. pl.	*ret-ium*	*corn-uum*
G.pl.	*pupp-ium*	*tribu-um*			

There are two nouns of the *i* declension, which deserve especial consideration, not only on their own account, but also on account of some remarkable assonances in the cognate languages, which might lead to misconception or confusion:—these are *res*, "a thing or object," and *mare*, "the sea." I have shown, in another work, that *res* = *h-ra-is* is a derivative from *hir* = *χείρ* (Varro, *L. L.* IV. 26), and that it must therefore be compared with the Greek *χρέος*, *χρεία*, *χρῆμα*, to which it bears the same relation as *læna*, *luridus*, &c. do to *χλαῖνα*, *χλωρός*, &c. Consequently, *res* is "that which is handled," and means an object of thought in accordance with that practical tendency of the

Roman mind which made them regard all realities as necessarily palpable[1], whereas the Greeks were contented with the evidence of the eyes. Thus while a Greek declared his certainty by the predicates ἐναργής[2], ἐμφανής, σαφής, &c., referring to light, the Roman brought every thing to the test of the touch, and pronounced a thing "manifest" (*mani-festa res*), when he could reach out his hand and feel it. With the Greeks the idea of handling was connected with that of facility, rather than with that of evidence: thus εὐχερής, "easy," is opposed to δυσχερής, "difficult:" and as μάρη in old Greek was a synonym of χείρ (and probably akin to *manus*), εὐμαρής is a common equivalent to εὐχερής (*Schol. Ven. ad Iliad.* XV. 37). Now this word μάρη brings us to the first of those apparent resemblances between the Greek and Latin, against which I would caution the student. For the *Etymolog. Magn.* directly connects μάρ-τυς "a witness" with μάρη "a hand," and thus brings us back to the Roman *manifesta res;* the compiler says (p. 78, 11): μάρτυς ὁ μάρψας καὶ εἰδὼς τὸ ἀληθές. But, as I have shown elsewhere (*New Crat.* § 450), μάρτυς is not immediately connected with μάρη, but belongs to the same application of the root as *me-mor*, μέρ-ιμνα, &c., so that it is expressive rather of the memory and spoken record than of the certainty of the thing declared. Again, μάρη bears an outward resemblance to the Latin *mare*, the other word under discussion, and the syllabic correspondence is strengthened by our knowledge of the fact, that θέναρ, which denotes "the hollow of

---

[1] Ariosto (*Orlando Furioso*, VII. 1) speaks of the vulgar belief as dependent on the sight and touch combined:

Chè 'l sciocco vulgo non gli vuol da fede,
Se non le *vede* e *tocca* chiare e piane.

[2] For this use of ἐναργής we may compare Æschyl. *Pers.* 179: ἀλλ' οὐδέπω τοίονδ' ἐναργὲς εἰδόμην with Soph. *Trach.* 11: φοιτῶν ἐναργὴς ταῦρος; which is opposed to ἀνδρείῳ κύτει βούπρῳρος or the partial assumption of the bovine form. Just in the same way we find in Shakspere (*K. John*, I. 2):

Mine eye hath well examined his parts,
And finds them *perfect* Richard.

And Milton says (*Parad. Reg.* I. 82):

I saw
A *perfect* dove descend;

i. e. ἐναργὴς περιστερά. Aristotle (*Eth. Nicom.* I. 1, 3) uses ἐναργὴς and φανερὸς as synonymous expressions for that which falls within the reach of our ordinary experience.

the hand," is also used to signify "the surface of the sea" (see Pind. *Isthm.* III. 74). But these are merely accidental coincidences: for, as we have seen above (p. 75), *ma-re* and the Sclavonian *mo-re* must be referred to the Semitic מַיִם, the second syllable being that which appears in the Greek ῥέω, the Etruscan *ril*, &c. Besides, *mare* does not signify "the *surface* of the sea," but the *mass* of water, as opposed to dry-land. The surface of the water is denoted by *pelagus*, directly borrowed from the Greek πέλαγος, which is connected with πλάξ, and means "an extended sheet of water;" hence πέλαγος signifies "the high-sea," and πελάγιος means "out at sea" (*New Crat.* § 280). If a river had burst its banks and covered a large expanse of country, it would be called a *mare*, or "flood," and might in that case exhibit a *pelagus* or "wide surface of water." Thus Virgil says of the mouth of the Po (*Æn.* I. 246):

It *mare* proruptum, et *pelago* premit arva sonanti.

"It rushes forth in a *flood*, and covers the lands with a roaring *sheet of water*." This view of the origin and signification of *ma-re* is important with reference to its form as a noun in *i*. We see this *i* in other words involving the root *re*, as *ri-vus*, *ri-l*, &c.; and considering the general meaning of adjectives in *-is*, we must come to the conclusion that *ma-r-e* is the neuter of an adjective *ma-re-is=ma-r-is=*ὑδροῤῥόος. To return to *res=hra-is*, the termination seems to indicate it as a doing, rather than as a thing done—as a "*hand-ling*" (*handlung*) rather than as a work,—as a χρῆσις rather than as a χρῆμα. Practically, however, *res* means a mere object of thought, a thing which is or may be handled; and this appears still more clearly from the use of *re-or*, "I think," i. e. "I propose a *res* to my mind," and its derivative *ra-tio* (from *ra-tus*), which implies the action of the verb, and denotes the *mode* or *act* of thinking. Still, it may be seen, by a little care in the examination, that the fixed or passive meaning of *res* is quite consistent with its original use as a noun of action. As we shall see, when we come to the *gerundia* and *gerundiva*, the difference between active and passive becomes evanescent when we descend to the infinitive or abstract use of a word. When we are speaking of the "winding-up of a business," "the closing of a shop," &c., it is obvious that we direct attention to the thing done, rather than to the act of doing it. Just so with *res* as opposed to *ratio*. Between these two the substantive *reus*

and the verb *reor* may be presumed to intervene. If *res* means a "handling," or "action," *reus* will denote the person implicated in the action; and as *res*, in a legal sense, denotes the cause and object of the controversy, in the same technical application *reus* will denote a person accused or impeached—*cujus res agitur*. And as *ratio* has no existence save through the verb *reor*, it must mean something more than the mere bodily handling implied by *res*. It must denote a mental operation consequent upon this contact. And, in point of fact, *ratio* always implies some intellectual process, or the plan and system which emanate from it. While *res* or *res familiaris* is the property, *ratio* is the account kept; *res publica* is the state or object of government, *ratio* is the mode of governing; *res* is the outer world, as in *natura rerum*, &c., *ratio* is the inner reason, which deals with it theoretically. And this opposition is even carried so far that, while *verborum ratio* is the arrangement of words, or the style (Cic. *de Oratore*, II. 15, § 64), we have *rerum ratio* (§ 63) for "history," or the arrangement of facts and actions.

The neuters in *e* of this declension are interesting as examples of the form which appears by the side of all masculine and feminine adjectives in *-is*, as *tristis*, neut. *triste*. Of course this theory assures us that the original ending of their neuter must have been *-id*, just as *ante* was originally *antid*. And this inference is confirmed by an obsolete neuter in *-is*, which bears the same relation to *-id* that *corpus*, *opus*, &c., do to the original *corpud*, *opud*, &c. This neuter is found in *potis*, *satis*, by the side of *pote* and *sat* (for *sate*); thus, Lucret. I. 452:

> Conjunctum est id, quod nunquam sine perniciali
> Discidio *potis* est sejungi seque gregari.

V. 716:

> Corpus enim licet esse aliud, quod fertur, et una
> Labitur omnimodis occursans efficiensque,
> Nec *potis* est cerni, quia cassum lumine fertur.

Terent. *Adelph.* IV. 1, 5: "ita fiat et istoc, si quid *potis* est rectius." Catull. LXXV. 24: "quod non *potis* est." LXXI. 7: "qui *potis* est." Corn. Nep. *Epam.* 4: "abstinentiæ erit hoc *satis* testimonium:" cf. *Hannib.* 6. These passages are quoted by Schwartze, *das alte Ægypten*, I. p. 637. The same explanation applies to *necessus* for *necessum* or *necesse*, in the *Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus*.

CHAPTER X.

PRONOUNS AND PRONOMINAL WORDS.

§ 1. General definitions. § 2. Personal Pronouns. § 3. Indicative Pronouns. § 4. Distinctive Pronouns. § 5. Relative, interrogative, and indefinite Pronouns. § 6. Numerals and degrees of comparison. § 7. Prepositions. § 8. Negative Particles.

§ 1. *General Definitions.*

THE term *pronoun*, in accordance with its original meaning, (*pronomen*, *ἀντωνυμία*), ought to denote only those words which are used as substitutes for nouns. But according to that which appears to me to be the only scientific classification, all words fall into two great divisions,—*pronouns*, or words which indicate *space* or *position*; and *words containing roots*, which express the positional relations of general attributes. The former do not allow any admixture with the other element of language: the latter require the addition of at least one pronominal suffix to make them words. I have therefore proposed[1] to call the *pronouns*, or *positional words*, the organizing, constituent, or formative element of inflected language, and the *roots* I would designate as the material element of human speech. With this extension of meaning the term *pronoun* will include not only the personal, demonstrative, and relative words, which it generally denotes, but also the prepositions, the conjunctions, and those adverbs which are not merely cases of nouns.

§ 2. *Personal Pronouns.*

Although the verb has three persons, the Latin language does not use more than two personal pronouns or general indications of the nominative case. For although *ego* and *tu* may be used with the first and second persons of the verb, which, as we shall see, are not consistently expressed by the inflexions; with the third person, which always ends in *-t* or *-tur*, the nominative is either omitted or expressed by a noun substantive. When, however, in the objective construction it is necessary to introduce a pronoun referring to the nominative of the verb, we employ the reciprocal or reflexive *se*. Thus, although *diceba-t* is a suf-

[1] *New Crat.* § 128.

ficient expression of "he said, or used to say," we must introduce *se* before an infinitive expressing the assertion; as: *diceba-t* SE *esse bonum virum*, "he said that *he* (the person, in question, who said) was a good man;" and as we should write *ego diceba-m* ME *esse*, or *tu diceba-s* TE *esse*, we may infer an original pronoun of the third person beginning with *s-* and corresponding to the Greek ὁ or ἵ, just as ἑ corresponds to *se*. But this form occurs only in the oblique cases, *sui, sibi, se*, and in the particles *si-c, si-ne, si*, and *se-d*.

The original inflexions of the two personal pronouns were as follows:

	Sing.	
N.	*e-go* or *ego-met*	*tu* or *tu-te*
G.	*mis*	*ti-s*
D.	*mi-hi* (for *mi-fi* or *mi-bi*)	*ti-bi*
A.	*me-he*	*te-he*
Abl.	*me-d*.	*te-d*.

For the plural, or rather the collective form, of the personal pronouns, we have two different roots corresponding to νῶι and σφῶι, which are used as the dual in Greek; and from these roots we have the nom., ac., voc. *no-s, vo-s;* dat., abl. *no-bi-s, vo-bi-s*. According to the analogy of νῶϊν, σφῶϊν, we ought also to have genitives *no-um* or *no-sum*, and *vo-um* or *vo-sum*. But these are not found. Indeed, although the singular genitives *mis, tis*, which may have been originally forms in *-jus*, like *hu-jus, e-jus*, &c., retained their use as late as Plautus, these also became obsolete in classical Latinity, and the genitive forms for the singular and plural were derived from the possessive adjectives *meus, tuus, nos-ter, ves-ter*. The connexion between the genitive and the epithet is well known (*New Crat.* § 298), and in all languages the possessive may take the place of the genitive of a pronoun. But in Latin and Greek we have not only a possessive in direct adjectival agreement with its noun, but, by a singular attraction, we have the genitive of the possessive used as if it were the genitive of the pronoun itself. I call this an attraction, for I think it must be explained by a transition from those idiomatic collocations, in which a dependent genitive stands by the side of the possessive. Thus we may say not only *mea scripta*, "my writings," for "the writings of me," but even *mea scripta recitare timentis* (Hor. I. *Serm.* 4, 23),

"the writings of me fearing to recite;" and not only ἡμετέρα ἔρις, "our contention," for "the contention of us," but even ἀγαθῶν ἔρις ἡμετέρα (Æschyl. *Eum.* 975), "the contention of us good persons." We see then how easy the transition may be from such phrases as *mea unius opera respublica est salva*, or *vestris paucorum respondet laudibus*, to *eam unius tui studio me assequi posse confido*, or *vestrum omnium voluntati paruit*. Hence we find that ultimately *mei* and *tui* were the only genitives of *ego* and *tu*, and *nostri* or *nostrum*, and *vestri* or *vestrum*, the only genitives of *nos* and *vos*. The same applies to the very defective pronoun of the third person, the reciprocal *se*, which has lost its nominative, and has only the genitive *sui*, the dative *sibi*, and the accusative or ablative *se*, for all genders and numbers. We must also consider the Greek ἐμοῦ, or μοῦ, anciently μεοῦ (*N. Crat.* § 134), and σοῦ, as properly belonging to the possessive. The hypothesis of an attraction, which I have proposed, is the only way of explaining the difference in the usage of *nostri*, *nostrum*, and of *vestri*, *vestrum*. That *nostrum*, *vestrum* are genitives plural, is clear from the fact that they were anciently used in the full forms *nostrorum*, *vestrorum;* thus in Plautus (*Mostell.* I. 3, 123) we have: *verum illud est, maximaque pars vostrorum intelligit*. As genitives they can only be explained by an attraction into the case of some plural genitive expressed or understood. In general, we do not find the genitive except when the personality is emphatically expressed; as in Ovid, *Heroid.* XIII. 166: *Si tibi cura mei, sit tibi cura tui*. Cic. *Catil.* IV. 9: *habetis ducem memorem vestri, oblitum sui*. And here it may stand by the side of an inflected possessive, as in Cic. *ad Fam.* XII. 17: *grata mihi vehementer est memoria nostri tua;* or even be opposed to one, as in Ovid, *Heroid.* VII. 134: *parsque tui lateat corpore clausa meo*. But whereas *nostri*, *vestri*, are used only when we speak of the persons as a whole; as: *memoria nostri tua*, "your recollection of us," as a single object of thought; *nostrûm*, *vestrûm* are employed when we speak of the persons as a collection of separate or separable elements. Accordingly, the latter is the form adopted after such a word as *pars* (in the passage quoted above from Plautus), and by the side of *omnium*, as in Cic. *Cat.* I. 7: *patria est communis omnium nostrûm parens*, "our native land is the common parent of all of us," many and separable as we are. But that it is really in this case an attraction from the inflected possessive, is

clear from such passages as Cic. *Cat.* IV. 2: *hi ad vestram omnium cædem Romæ restiterunt.* We have a genitive by the side of the possessive in the construction of the impersonal verbs, or rather phrases, *rē-fert=rei fert,* "it contributes to the interest," and *interest,* "it is concerned about the business," where *rei* is understood in the sense in which the Latin verb has become an English substantive[1]. In these phrases we have either a gen. of the person or persons interested, or the possessive pronouns, *meā, tuā, suā, nostrā, vestrā,* agreeing with the dative *rei,* expressed in *rē-fert,* and understood in *interest.* Thus we have: *faciundum aliquid, quod illorum magis, quam sua rē-tulisse videretur,* "he must do something which might seem to have been more for the interest of those others than for his own;" *Cæsar dicere solebat non tam suâ quam reipublicæ interesse, ut salvus esset,* "Cæsar used to say that it was not so much for his interest as for that of the state that he should be safe." That *re* for *rei* is the dative, and consequently that *meā, suā,* &c., here stand for *meæ, suæ,* &c., is proved by the competent testimony of Verrius (Festus, p. 282, ed. Müller): *re-fert quum dicimus, errare nos ait Verrius. Esse enim rectum* REI FERT, *dativo scilicet, non ablativo casu.* In Cato, *R. R.* c. 3, we have: *et rei et virtuti et gloriæ erit.* That *fero* may be used absolutely without any accusative is clear from such phrases as: *dum tempus ad eam rem tulit* (Ter. *Andr.* I. 2, 17), *dum ætas tulit* (id. ibid. II. 6, 12), *nunc ita tempus fert, ut cupiam* (*Heaut.* IV. 1, 54), *scilicet ita tempus fert* (*Adelph.* V. 3, 5). And it is unnecessary to show that *fero,* like λυσιτελέω, may govern the *dativus commodi.* The change of *æ* into *a* is found also in *post-hac, inter-ea,* &c., which will be explained immediately.

§ 3. *Indicative Pronouns.*

The three pronouns, *hic, iste, ille* are called indicative, because they indicate, as *objects,* the three personal pronouns, which, in the cases already considered, are expressed as *subjects* of the verb. *Hic,* "this," "the person or thing *here,*" indicates the speaker and all close to him; *iste,* "that of yours," indicates the person addressed and those in his proximity; *ille,* "that

[1] For *re* = *rei* in this sense cf. Plaut. *Trinumm.* III. 2, 9 = 635: *tuæ re consulere cupio.*

other," indicates all distant persons and objects. This distinction was well known to the oldest grammarians, and is fully borne out by the consistent usage of the best writers. Priscian's distinction is rather vague: he says (XVII. 9. § 58, Vol. II. p. 39, Krehl): "Demonstrativa [sunt] *hic*, *iste*, et *ille*. Sed interest quod *ille* spatio longiore intelligitur, *iste* vero propinquiore; *hic* autem non solum de præsente, verum etiam de absente possumus dicere, ad intellectum referentes demonstrationem, ut, *hoc regnum dea gentibus esse* Virgilius ad absentem Carthaginem retulit demonstrationem." But Laurentius Valla has given the personal reference of the three pronouns with the greatest accuracy (*Elegant.* II. c. IV. p. 39. ed. Aldina 1536): "de *me* loquens dicere debeo *hoc caput, hæc manus, hæc civitas.* De *te* vero *istud caput, ista manus, ista civitas.* De *tertia* autem *persona illud caput, illa manus, illa civitas.* Cicero in Antonium (*Phil.* II. 25): *tu istis faucibus*, &c., h. e. *istis tuis faucibus*, &c. Unde nascuntur adverbia *istic, istinc, istac, istuc, istorsum, isto.* Ut idem ad Valerium juris consultum: *qui istinc veniunt aiunt te superbiorem esse factum*, i. e. qui ab *ista* provincia in *qua agis, huc* in Italiam Romamque veniunt." Practically we find that *hic* and *iste* are opposed as *I* and *you*, and *hic* and *ille* as *near* and *distant.* Thus we find (Cic. *Acad.* IV. 33): "iisdem *hic* sapiens, *de quo loquor*, oculis, quibus *iste vester* terram, mare, intuebitur;" and (*pro Rabirio* II.): "si *illos, quos jam videre non possumus*, negligis, ne *his* quidem, *quos vides*, consuli putas oportere." And thus in reference to circumstances previously mentioned, *ille* denotes the former or more distant, *hic* the latter or nearer particular; as in Propert. III. 14, 17:

> Qualis et Eurotæ Pollux et Castor arenis,
> *Hic* victor pugnis, *ille* futurus equis.

The same distinctions are observable in certain peculiar usages. Thus Terence has (*Andr.* II. 1, 10): "tu si *hic* sis, aliter sentias," "if you were *in my place*, you would think otherwise." In lawsuits *iste*, "the man before *you*," i. e. the *judices*, is the defendant: hence, we find this pronoun used with a certain expression of contempt to indicate a person who has been brought unfavourably before the notice of those whom we are addressing; whereas *ille*, "that other," as indicating a person so striking as to attract our attention in spite of his remoteness, is often used to denote a well-known or eminent individual, as: "magnus *ille*

Alexander," or "Medea *illa*." In all these usages the triad *hic, iste, ille,* correspond to the Greek ὅδε, οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος. This is especially seen in the employment of ὅδε and οὗτος to designate the first and second persons respectively. Thus Œdipus is made to say of himself: οὔτι μὴ λάχωσι τοῦδε συμμάχου (*Œd. C.* 450); but he is addressed by the subterraneous voice (*ibid.* 1627): ὦ οὗτος, οὗτος Οἰδίπους, τί μέλλομεν; The speaker in a law-court designates himself, his client, and his affairs, by ὅδε; but the defendant is οὗτος = *iste*, "the man before you" (the judges). In continuous narrative τάδε are the things which I am about to say, which are before *me*, but not yet before my readers; whereas ταῦτα are the things just said, and which have been submitted to them. This shows that the true reading in Æschylus, *Suppl.* 313, must be:

ΧΟ. Βῆλον δίπαιδα πατέρα τοῦδ' ἐμοῦ πατρός.
ΒΑ. τὸ πᾶν σαφῶς νυν ὄνομα τούτου μοι φράσον.

For the Chorus having spoken of their father as present by them (τοῦδε), the King, in his reply, would designate him as by their side (τούτου).

With regard to the etymology of the indicative pronouns, there can be no doubt that the first part of *hi-c* corresponds to the Greek ἵ, which appears as the nominative of the reflexive ἕο = οὗ, οἷ, ἕ. It is therefore a subsidiary form of ὁ = σο, and while the *h* is represented by a more original sibilant in *si-c*, *se*, &c., it has vanished altogether in *i-s*, *i-terum*, *i-tem*, &c. The most original form represented the *anlaut* as a strong combination of the guttural and labial, which we call the digamma, and thus *qui*, *si-c*, *hi-c*, *i-s*, will be four forms of the same pronominal root signifying proximity, in which the guttural element has successively degenerated. The sibilant form, which is regularly found in the Sanscrit *sa*, *sak*, *sô*, and in the Umbrian *eso*, &c., where there is an initial vowel as in ἐμέ, compared with μέ, was still extant in the days of Ennius, who writes *sa-m*, *sa-psa*, *su-m*, *so-s*. The guttural appears without any labial affection in the affix *-c-* or *-ce*, and in the forms *cis*, *citra*, *ceteri*, &c. As there is reason to believe that the first syllable of the Umbrian *e-so* is a residuum of the second pronominal element F*a*, analogous to the *i* in *i-s*, &c., the form *e-su-k* (above, p. 85) is really a combination of three, as *hi-c* is of two similar elements. The Latin forms *e-ho*, *e-ja*, *e-go* (*New Crat.* § 134) might lead us

to infer that *hi-c* may originally have been *e-hi-c* = *e-su-c*. As the first element, in this repetition of cognate syllables, was generally omitted in Latin, so we find that the final *-c* was dropt in the usual form of the genitive *hujus*, though *hujus-ce* occasionally appears, and was usually omitted in the plural, with the exception of the nom., accus., voc. neuter *hæ-c* = *ha-ce*, though good writers have occasionally *hi-c* for *hi* (Varro, *L. L.* VI. 73), and *hæ-c* for *hæ* (Plaut. *Aulul.* III. 5, 59; Ter. *Eun.* III. 5, 34; *Phorm.* V. 8, 23, &c.), in the nom. masc. and fem. The neuter *hæ-c* furnishes us with the clue to some important analogies.

If there is good reason to connect *hi-c* = *e-hi-c* with the Umbrian *e-su-k*, there is still more reason for seeking an affinity between the second indicative pronoun *is-te* and the Umbrian *es-tu*. The latter combination will not allow us to doubt that the final syllable is identical with the second personal pronoun. Its adjectival inflexion in three genders is a subsequent result of its usage. But there is no reason to conclude that the forms *-tius*, *tî* (for *-tibi*), *-tum*, *-to*, are not as original as *tis*, *tibi* and *te*. The identity of the first part of *esu-k* or *e-hi-c* and *es-tu*, as indicatives of the first and second pronouns, is supported by the Hebrew *'han-ô-ki*, "I," and *'han-tâ* = *'hat-tâ*, "thou," which are similarly distinguished by the affix only. And such forms as *e-go-met*, ἐ-γώ-νη, Sanscrit *a-ha-m*, show that the syllables *e-go*, *a-ha*, *e-ho*, &c., do not in themselves indicate the first person, though they strongly exhibit the idea of nearness as opposed to that of all other positions. But although *-c* is the distinction between the first and second pronouns of indication, such is the general usefulness of this adjunct that it is occasionally, though rarely, appended even to certain forms of *is-te*, as *is-tæc*, &c. And, what is still more singular, we find even *illæc*, &c. These are irregularities, and the general distinction of *hi-c* and *is-te* remains as I have described it; and thus their relative meanings of "here" and "near to the here" are fully supported by their etymology.

An analysis of the third indicative pronoun *ille* leads to results quite as interesting as that of the other two. There cannot be any doubt that *ille*, "that other," and *alius*, "another," agreeing as they do in declension and primitive meaning, are only different forms of one and the same word: and thus the double *l* of *ille* will belong to the same form of assimilation as

the Greek synonym ἄλλος (*New Cratyl.* § 215). The other forms, under which the root of *ille* or *alius* occurs, are *ollus*, which is a common archaism of *ille*, and is found even in *Virgil*; *ol-im* for *oll-im* ("antiqui enim litteram non geminabant," Fest.) = *illo tempore*; *solus* = *se-olis* = *sine aliis*; *uls* (opposed to *cis*, as *ille* is to *hic*) = *illo loco*; *al-ter* and *ul-tra*, *ul-terior*, *ul-timus*, expressing relative degrees of distance and separation; and *ul-tro* signifying movement to a degree beyond expectation. To these must be added compounds beginning with *ali-*, as *ali-quis*, &c. The *l* is retained in the Goth. *alis*, O. N. *ella*, A. S. *ele*, O. H. G. *ali*; but a comparison with the Sanscrit *an-ya* = *alius*, *an-tara* = *alter*, and the Goth. *an-thar*, O. N. *an-nar*, A. S. *other*, O. H. G. *an-dar*, &c., leads us to the conclusion that the original form must have involved an *n*, and thus we fall back on the Greek expression for distant locality,—*ἀ-νά*, and ultimately arrive at κεῖνος = κ-έν-ιος (cf. ἔνιος), the synonym of *ille* in its regular use, and κα-τά, the correlative of *ἀνά*, both as a preposition and as a particle (*New Crat.* §§ 135, 138). As it may be shown that *ἀνά*, in its most distinct significations, is represented by *in* (*New Crat.* § 170), it will follow that *ille* = *in-yus* bears the same relation to *in* that ἄλλος does to *ἀνά*. And while the *a* in all these forms is more original than the *i* (above, p. 261), it is equally clear that the Latin *ol-* and *ul-* are successive extenuations of the original vowel, caused in part by the change of *n* into *l* (p. 259). Of all the words, into which this root enters, *ultro* alone obscures the original meaning of "distance and separation." It seems to be used as a synonym of *sponte*, which signifies "of one's own accord" or "free inclination." But an accurate examination of all the passages in which it occurs, enables us to trace it back to its original meaning, "to a place beyond," which is still found in such phrases as *ultro istum a me*, "take him far from me" (Plaut. *Capt.* III. 4, 19), *ultro citroque*, "thither and hither," *his lacrymis vitam damus, et miserescimus ultro*, "to these tears we grant his life, and pity him besides" (see Döderlein, *Syn. u. Etym.* III. 103, sqq.). Hence, while *s-ponte*, which is the abl. of *s-pons* or *ex-pons*, a derivative of another form of *pondus*, means "by its own weight or inclination," "of its own accord," "unbidden" (Hor. I. *Epist.* XII. 17: *sponte suâ, jussæne*); *ul-tro* means "going still farther," "going beyond expectation," "showing an activity which excites surprise," or the like. Thus we

find such phrases as (Tac. *Ann.* XIII. 23): *commotis qui aderant, ultroque spiritus ejus mitigantibus,* "when those who stood by were affected, and, what is more, actively bestirred themselves to pacify her wrath," and (Hor. *Carm.* IV. 4, 51): *sectamur ultro quos opimus fallere et effugere est triumphus,* "contrary to all expectation, we pursue when we ought to be only too happy to escape." To complete the analysis of the third indicative pronoun, it is worth while to notice that the affix *hunt* or *hont,* which marks this pronoun in Umbrian, is clearly connected with the English *yon* in *yonder, be-yond,* &c.; and this brings us at once, through the Goth. *jains, jaind,* N. H. G. *jener,* &c. to the Greek κεῖνος, and the root of *ille.* And thus we see that the common Latin, like the Greek, has lost the three full forms of the distinctive pronouns, which are preserved in the Umbrian *esu-k* (= *ehic* = *hic*), "the particular thing here," *es-tu* (= *is-te*), "the particular thing where you are," and *er-ont* = *es-ont* (= -κεῖνος = *ille*), "the particular thing yonder." The form ἐ-κεῖνος may be a residuum of ἐσ-κεῖνος = *es-ont,* and the same explanation may apply to ἐ-μέ, &c. Practically we find that *ille* = *al-ius* differs from *al-ter* as plurality differs from duality, that is, as ἄλλος = ἄλ-ιος differs from ἕ-τερος; for *al-ius,* ἄλλος denote "that other person of many," and *al-ter,* ἕ-τερος "that other person of two." On the general differences in meaning and use between the comparative affixes in *-ius* or *-ior* and *-ter-,* the reader may consult the *New Cratylus,* § 165.

§ 4. *Distinctive Pronouns.*

The elements *is-, e-ho, e-so, hi-,* which, we have seen, constitute the initial syllable or syllables of the indicative pronouns, appear without any affix in the merely distinctive pronoun *is.* In the older Latin Grammars it used to be the custom to exhibit the indicative *hic* as a sort of prepositive article: but this function, so far as the Latin language is capable of performing it at all, belongs rather to the weaker form *is,* which *distinguishes* the particular person referred to, especially when the distinction is supported by a defining relative sentence. Thus, *is Piso* in Sallust, *Catil.* c. 19, is as nearly as possible ὁ Πίσων. The functions of *is,* as a distinctive pronoun, are carried still farther by its association with two derivatives *i-dem* and *i-pse* (sometimes *ipsus*). If we except that meaning of *is,* which has been already

mentioned, and according to which it appears as the correlative and antecedent to *qui*, so that *is qui* means "the particular person who," and the relative sentence becomes equivalent to the Greek participle with the article; we shall find that *is* and its two derivatives enable us to reproduce in Latin the different usages of αὐτός. Thus, *is* is a mere pronoun of reference like the oblique cases of αὐτός; *uxor ejus* is the exact counterpart of ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ, "his wife" or "the wife of a person already mentioned and referred to;" *jungit eos* renders ζεύγνυσιν αὐτούς, "he yokes them," *i. e.* the cattle already mentioned. *Idem* means more emphatically "the very he," "the same man," like ὁ αὐτός. And *ipse* signifies "the man himself," or "the man distinguished from others," like αὐτός, when it is used as a secondary predicate in apposition without the article (*Complete Greek Gramm.* art. 445, a). The declension of *is*, namely, *is, ea, id*, gen. *ejus*, &c., is preserved in *i-dem* for *is-dem, ea-dem, ĭ-dem* for *id-dem*, gen. *ejus-dem*, &c., so that *dem* becomes a mere appendage like the Greek περ, δή, to both of which it partly corresponds in meaning, and to the latter of which it is directly related. In the classical use of *ipse*, on the contrary, the first part, or the *is*, remains uninflected, while the second syllable is regularly declined; thus: *i-psus, i-psa, i-psum*, gen. *i-psius*, &c. There are two ways of explaining this phenomenon. We may either suppose that the *ps-* represents an inversion of the reciprocal σφ- analogous to the Doric ψέ, ψίν: and thus the inflexion of the second part only will correspond to the Greek forms ἐμαυτοῦ, ἑαυτοῦ, &c., where the first part is immoveable. This is Bopp's theory. But it may with justice be objected that *ipse* corresponds to αὐτός, and that we have the combinations *me ipsum, se ipsum*, &c. Besides, we find in the older writers that the included *is* is regularly declined, while the affix *-pse* remains as an immutable appendage, just like the *-dem* of *i-dem;* thus we have *eam-pse* (Plaut. *Cistell.* I. 3, 22; *Aul.* V. 7), *ea-pse illa* (*Curcul.* IV. 3, 2), *eo-pse illo* (ibid. 5): and especially in the combination *re ea-pse*, or *reapse* (Festus, p. 278, Müller). Since therefore we find another affix *-pte* also appended not only to the declined forms of *is*, as *in eo-pte* (Festus, p. 110, cf. *ipsippe* = *ipsipte*, p. 105), but also to *vos, mihi, meo, suo*, &c. as *vo-pte, mihi-pte, meo-pte, suo-pte*, &c., as this cannot be referred to an inversion of *sv*, but may bear the same relation to

-pse that the original supines in *-tum* do to the secondary forms in *-sum*, I fall back on the other explanation, and consider *-pte* an indeclinable affix analogous to ποτε, which has been softened into *-pse*, perhaps from an original assimilation in *is-pte* (cf. δίσκος for δίκ-σκος, λέσχη from λέγ-σκη, &c.).

The declension of *is, ejus*, reminds us at once of *hi-c, hu-jus*, and it is clear that the former is only a weaker modification of the latter, just as the Greek ἵ is of the older ἴ (*New Crat.* § 139). The most striking differences in the inflexions of *is* and *hi-c* are entirely due to the *-c* or *-ce* appended to the latter, and there is reason to believe that this affix, which appears attached to all the indicative pronouns, was originally appended also to the distinctive *is* and the relative *qui*. Indeed, as *qui, si-c, hi-c* and *is* are successive degenerations of one and the same form, there is no reason to exclude from the first and last the strengthening appendage which so constantly appears with the two intermediate words. To say nothing of the alleged occurrence of such forms as *eis-ce* (Plaut. *Mercat. prol.* 91), *ejus-ce* (Aul. Gell. *lemm.* c. XIV. l. 111), *cujus-ce* (Cic. *de Invent.* II. 45. § 134), &c., the original appendage of *-ce* to the neuter plurals at least of *is* and *qui* may be proved by the following induction. Where the accus. neut. pl. of *is* becomes fixed in combination with certain prepositions, as in *inter-eā, post-eā, præter-eā*, &c., the *ā* is long. It is therefore fair to conclude that, when these compounds were formed, there was some reason for the length of the plural *ă*, which as a general rule is short in all Greek and Latin words. Now we find in Latin *post-hac* = *post-hæc, qua-propter* = *quæ-propter*, and *meā refert* = *meæ rei fert*. Therefore *ā* may represent *ae*. And as *post-hāc, quā-propter* are entirely analogous to *posteā, propterea*, it follows that the neuter plural of *is* was anciently *eæ*, just as the neuter plurals of *hic* and *qui* were *hæ-c* and *quæ*. But *ae* = *ai*, therefore *eæ, quæ* stand for *eă-i, quă-i*; and as the neuter plural *hæc* can only be explained as a residuum of *hă-ce* or *hă-cis*, the final *i* in the two other cases must represent a lost guttural fulcrum. This view is confirmed by the fact that the Oscan represents *post-eā* under the form *post-esa-k* (above, p. 121); and the same explanation applies to *post-illā* = *post-illa-c*. The strongest confirmation of this view is furnished by the fact that no other probable explanation has been offered. For the only suggestion, which

merits a moment's attention—namely, that the long *ā* may be occasioned by the absorption of the *d* which is still seen in *arvorsum ead*, &c., falls to the ground when we consider that the neuter plural must always have terminated in a double dental, or the combination *-nt*, which is uniformly represented by a short *ă*, so that the *d* is elided and not absorbed (*New Crat.* § 239). The other supposition, that *posteā* is for *posteam*, on the analogy of *postquam*, &c., is undeserving of any notice except as a specimen of philological imbecility. As I have elsewhere remarked (*New Crat.* § 240, note): "every Latin scholar is aware that *quam* is not here a case after *post*, &c., but the particle of comparison, so that the full form is, in fact, *post-eā-quam*, &c.[1]"

§ 5. *Relative, Interrogative, and Indefinite Pronouns.*

In its syntactical use, the relative connects with the indicative or distinctive pronouns, and especially with *is*, its regular antecedent or correlative, some fuller description of the person or thing indicated. And thus, whether the antecedent is definite or vague, the relative sentence exists only by virtue of its correlative; consequently, it is a syntactical contrivance which plays the same part as the adjective or genitive case. Etymology fully confirms this view of the matter, which is derived from the logic of the sentence, and without any reference to the forms of words: for we see that the correlative pronouns, *is* and *qui*, are manifestly identical with one another, and with the affix of the genitive case, which forms the basis of the possessive adjective (cf. *New Crat.* §§ 148, 243, 300). The common origin of all these forms and of the Greek definite article is, as might be expected, the second pronominal element, which indicates relative proximity. The *anlaut* or initial articulation of this pronoun is the sound which we call *digamma*, and which represents some combination of the guttural with the labial. In the Greek forms ὅς, κοῦ, κέν, &c., in the Latin *hi-c*, *si-c*, *is*, &c., and in the Sanscrit *yas*,

---

[1] When the author of this precious etymology says that "the other word *quæ* owed its length possibly to the circumstance of its being a monosyllable, just as *vis* 'force' has a long *i*, *navis*, &c. a short *i*," I can only suppose that he does not know the difference between a crude form in *-r* like *vis* = *vir-s*, pl. *vīr-es*, *vīr-ium*, and one in *-i* like *navi-s*, pl. *naves*, *navium*.

kas, &c., we have only a guttural residuum, and the *j* = τι is still farther degenerated in τις, τε, &c. In που, and the old Italian *pit*, *pe*, &c., the labial alone remains. But in the Latin relative and indefinite *qui* and *quis*, and in the corresponding particles, we have the genuine and original combination of both elements, the labial however being vocalized into *u*, or rather represented by a mute *v* (above, p. 248).

It is usual to distinguish *quis* from *qui* merely by the use of the former as interrogative and of the latter as relative, and no one has been found to recognise the inherent distinction of the two words. The fact is that *quis*, *quæ* (or rather *quă*), *quid*, is the original form, corresponding to *is*, *eă*, *id*; and as *ille* has a secondary form *ollus* or *aliŭs*, which is used as its adjective, so *qui*, *quæ*, *quod* represent an adjective, and this must have contained the additional vowel *o*=*u*, which appears in so many of its cases. It has long been observed that in all interrogative and indefinite pronouns the form *quod* is used as an adjective and the form *quid* as a substantive; thus, we say: *aliquod monstrum*, "some monster;" but *aliquid monstri*, "something of a monster." The same remark really applies to the differences between the simple *qui* and *quis*; and the two words may be arranged, as far as the forms exist, in different declensions, the adjective belonging to the vowel declensions, and the substantive to the consonantal formations of nouns. It is true that with regard to the oblique cases, subsequent usage and habitual corruption have introduced many interchanges and confusions of form, but the farther we go back, and the more carefully we examine the derived and collateral words, the more reason do we find for the conclusion that *quis* is substantival and consonantal, and *qui* adjectival and belonging to the vowel declensions.

	Consonantal-form.		Vowel-form.		
	Singular.				
	M. F.	N.	M.	F.	N.
N.	*quis*	*quid*	*qui*	*quă* (later *quæ*)	*quod*
G.	*cu-jus*			*quo-jus*	
D.	**cu-bi* or *cui*			*quo-i*	
Ac.	*quem*	*quid*	**quum*	*quam*	*quod*
Abl.	*quî*	*quid*	*quo*	*qua*	*quo*

			Plural.		
	M.F.	N.	M.	F.	N.
N. Ac.	*ques*	**quia*	N. *qui*	*quæ*	*qua=quā* (later *quæ*)
	—	—	G. *quorum*	*quarum*	*quorum*
D. Abl.	*quibus*			*queis*	
			A. *quos*	*quas*	*qua* (*quæ=quā*)

The forms marked * occur only as particles in ordinary Latin. Practically the feminine *quă* or *quæ* is used either interrogatively or relatively, either substantively or adjectively; but in the derived form *quis-quam* there is no feminine inflexion, though this form is sometimes used with feminine nouns, as in Plautus, *Cistellaria*, I. 1, 68: *quod neque habeo nec quisquam alia mulier*, and in Plautus, *Mil. Gl.* IV. 2, 68=1060, the best MSS. have: *non hic suo seminio quenquam porcellam inperiturust.* With regard to those passages in which *quis* and *quid* are said to be used as adjectives, we must be careful to avoid the confusion which has led to this mode of interpreting them. Schmidt says (*de Pronomine Gr. et Lat.* p. 53): "inter *quis* et *qui*, *quid* et *quod* hoc plerumque intercedere discrimen tradunt quod alterum pronomen sit substantivum, alterum adjectivum. Sed *quis* quoque sæpissime vim habet adjectivi." And he proceeds to quote, among other passages, Plaut. *Men.* III. 2, 33 =498: *responde adolescens, quid nomen tibist?* Cic. *pro Deiot.* 13, 37: *quæ enim fortuna aut quis casus aut quæ tanta possit injuria... decreta delere?* Yet the distinction which he immediately afterwards quotes from Kritz (*ad Sallust. Catil.* c. 44) ought to have taught him that the adjectival use of *quis* in these passages is merely apparent, especially as there is the same distinction between the German *wer* and *was*, which are substantival, and *welcher*, which is declined like a regular substantive. As Kritz says, *quis* and *quid* merely ask for the name, but *qui* and *quod* inquire respecting the kind, condition, or quality of the person or thing. Thus, in the passages adduced by Grysar (*Theorie des lat. Styls*, p. 88) and in those quoted above, *quis* stands by itself, or in apposition to a noun, but *qui*, like an adjective, is a definitive epithet, e. g. T. *Quis fuit igitur?* P. *Iste Chærea.* T. *Qui Chærea* (Ter. *Eun.* V. 1, 7), i. e. "*who* was it then? That Chærea of yours. *Which* Chærea?"—where the first question refers to the unknown name, and the second

seeks a distinction between him and others who bore the same designation. Similarly, in the passages quoted above, when there is an opposition, *quid tibi nomen est* means "*what* is your name?" but *quod nomen* would mean "*which* name?" *quis casus* means "*what* chance?" or "*what for* a chance?" as the Scotch say: but *qui casus* would mean "*which* chance?" or "what kind of a chance?" Just the same is the distinction of *wer* or *was* and *welcher* given in the German dictionaries. For if the question is: *wer hat dir es gegeben?* "who has given it to you?" and the answer is, *mein Bruder*, "my brother," we should add the further question, *welcher?* "which brother?" if there were more than one.

The adjectival character of *qui* as distinguished from *quis* is common to the genitive of all the demonstrative and relative pronouns which end in *-jus*, as *hu-jus, ist-ius, ill-ius, e-jus, ips-ius, cu-jus, quo-jus.* We have seen that the personal pronouns use, instead of their proper genitive, the genitive of their possessives, *meus, tuus, suus*, and analogy would lead us to infer that something similar is found in the other pronouns. Now *cujus, -a, -um* is a regular adjective, and its derivative *cujas, cujātis* must be compared with Greek forms like πολιήτης, Ἰταλιώτης, (*N. Crat.* § 259). It is clear that these last forms must be derived from the ablative-genitive of nouns in *-ι*. Such a case we have in the form πόλ-εως from πόλις, *prît-yâs* from *prîtis;* and I suggested long ago that the Latin *jus* represents under a weaker form this genitive ending *-yâs* or *-εως=yως* for *-ιοθεν* (*N. Crat.* § 248). The other explanations, which were proposed before or after mine, may be seen in a paper by Aufrecht (*Zeitschrift f. Vergl. Sprachf.* 1851, p. 232). The suggestion that the genitive *cujus* is merely the adjective *cujus*, with a fixed inflexion like the *-mini* of the passive verb, is objectionable, as well on other accounts, as because it is contrary to the analogy of *mei, tui, sui*, which exhibit the genitives of the possessive pronoun. The long *i* in *-īus* is of course due to the absorption of a previous vowel, and the same must be the case with the Sanscrit possessives in *-îya.* The short *u* of the termination is illustrated by a very complete analogy. There can be no doubt that ἕως τε, ἕς τε and *us-que* spring from a common origin; and thus we see at once that the terminations of *cu-jus* and πόλ-εως are identical.

The guttural *anlaut* of the Latin relative and interrogative

is lost in *ubi*, *unde* (cf. *ali-cubi*, *ali-cunde*), *un-quam* (cf. *-cunque*), *uter* (cf. κότερος), &c.

Extensions of the relative or interrogative form indefinite or indefinite-relative pronouns, which are accurately distinguished by the best writers. Thus *ali-quis* = *alius-quis* or *ille-quis*, *quis-piam*, and *qui-dam*, denote "some one in particular," though the object is not named; *quis-que* means "every one;" *quis-quis* and *qui-cunque* "whosoever;" *qui-vis* and *qui-libet*, "any you please;" *quis-quam* and its adjective *ullus* = *unulus*, "any at all." Hence the words in the first group are obscurely definite; *quisque*, *quisquis*, and *quicunque* include all persons or things referred to; *quivis* and *quilibet* allow an unlimited range of choice; and *quisquam* and *ullus* exclude all the objects specified. The first syllables of *ali-quis* have been discussed above, and there is no difficulty in understanding the compound as significant of separative uncertainty—"that other some one." As *quis-piam* and *qui-dam* very nearly correspond in meaning, their etymological analysis ought to lead to similar results. With regard to the former there can be no doubt that *quis-piam* = *quis-pe-iam*. Now *pe* is obviously equivalent to *que* and τε: cf. *nem-pe*, *nam-que*. Consequently *quis-pe-iam* = *quis-que-jam* = ὅστις τε δή, "some one whoever it may be." The correspondence of *pe* and τε in this case is confirmed by the exact agreement of *quippe* = *quia pe* and ἅτε (to which δή is sometimes added) in the sense "inasmuch as:" for *quia* is the old neuter plural of *quis*. In many of its usages *jam* corresponds in meaning to the Greek δή, as in the cases just now compared. But in form there is a much closer affinity between δή and the affix *-dam* or *-dem*. Thus *qui-dam* is exactly ὅς δή, and *qui-dem* is γε δή. To the same class belongs *demum*, which Ebel (*Zeitschr. f. Vergl. Sprachf.* 1851, p. 308,) would explain as a superlative from the preposition *de*, on the analogy of *primum* from *præ*. The forms *tan-dem* and *pri-dem* show that this explanation is untenable; and the latter at all events proves that *dem* and *pri* are not contradictory designations of time. The true explanation is suggested by *deni-que* and its by-forms *donc-c* and *doni-cum*. Greek particles expressing time end either in κα = κεν, as αὐτί-κα, πηνί-κα, τηνί-κα, ἠνί-κα, or in τε, as ὅ-τε, τό-τε, πό-τε, εὖ-τε, ἑκάστο-τε, &c. It is clear that these endings are ultimately identical; but it may be concluded, that, while the latter gives rather a

degree of precision to the term, the former, which more immediately corresponds to the well-known particle of the apodosis, comes nearer in meaning to the Latin *cun-que* = *-πο-τε*, and our *-soever*. The Latin *-que* corresponds in some cases to *-κα* or *ἄν*, in others to *-τε*. Thus, while *-cun-que* is *πο-τε*, there can be no doubt as to the equivalence of *ubi-que* and *ὅπου ἄν*, of *τηνί-κα* and *denique* (*New Crat.* § 196).

The substitution of the tenuis for the medial in the Greek forms is not universal, for we have *ὅτε δή* by the side of *quando*, and when this apparent difference is removed, we have no difficulty in seeing the exact correspondence between *τῆμος*, as opposed to *ἦμος*, and *demum*, for which, according to Festus (p. 70, Müller), Livius Andronicus wrote *demus*. As the element *dem* is placed indifferently before or after the particle which it qualifies (cf. *deni-que* with *tan-dem*, *pri-dem*) we shall understand the correspondence between *qui-dam*, *ὅστις δή*, and the synonymous *δή τις* = *nescio quis* (Heindorf *ad Plat. Phædon.* p. 107 d). *Jam* is related to *dam*, *δήν*, as *Janus* to *Dianus*, &c., and thus *quispiam* = *ὅς τις τε δή* or *ὅς τις δή ποτε* falls into a near resemblance to *qui-dam* = *ὅς δή* or *δή τις*. The difference between *aliquis* and *quispiam* consists in the shade of definiteness conveyed to the former by its prefix *ali-*, so that while *aliquis* means "some one in particular," *quispiam* means generally "some one" or "any one." Thus in Cicero (*de Orat.* II. c. 9. § 38), we have: "si de rebus rusticis agricola *quispiam*, aut etiam, id quod multi, medicus de morbis, aut de pingendo pictor *aliquis* diserte dixerit aut scripserit, non idcirco artis illius putanda sit eloquentia." The addition of the *id quod multi* shows that *quispiam* is more general than *aliquis*: "if any person versed in agriculture shall have written or spoken with eloquence on rural affairs, or even any physician on diseases, as many have done, or *some* painter on painting, &c." That there is much the same distinction between *aliquis* and *quispiam* as between *aliquis* and *quis*, is proved by the existence and usage of the compound *aliquispiam* or *aliquipiam* (see Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* III. 9). In the case of *aliquis* itself a stronger signification of separation or definiteness may be conveyed by writing at length *alius quis* or *quis alius* (see the passages quoted by Drakenborch, *ad Liv.* V. 13. § 4. p. 59). The parallelism between *quippe* = *quia-pe* and *ἅτε* might lead us to conclude that *ut-pote*,

which is all but a synonym of *quippe*, is merely a compound of *ut* and a form involving *-pe* and equivalent to the termination *-pte* discussed above. As however there is no Latin word *-pote* equivalent to the Greek ποτε, and as the phrase *ut pote* = *ut potest* actually occurs in Varro (*apud Non.* c. 2. n. 876 : *viget, veget, ut pote, plurimum*), we may fairly conclude that we have here a phrase like *scilicet, duntaxat*, and not a mere combination of pronominal elements, so that *ut pote* means "as is possible." The suggestion of Döderlein that it stands for *ut puta* does not deserve a moment's consideration.

That *quilibet* involves the impersonal *libet* is obvious on the slightest examination; and notwithstanding the difficulty occasioned by the particle *-ve*, we must conclude that the 2nd pers. sing. of *volo* is the affix of *quivis*. This is not only deducible from the analogy of *quilibet*, but is shown by a passage in Cato (*R. R.* c. 52) where a noun is interposed between *qui* and *vis*: "hoc modo *quod* genus *vis* propagabis."

What has been already said of *cun-que* = *cum-que* = πο-τε applies to other uses of the affix *-que*, as *quis-que, uter-que, undi-que, utrin-que, ubi-que, us-que, quo-que*. There is much general truth in Schmidt's definition of *quisque* (*de pronom. Gr. et Lat.* p. 100): "pronomen indefinitum rem mente conceptam et e rerum ejusdem generis cumulo ac serie exemtam significat. *Que* autem particula si ad pronomen additur, pronominis vis extenditur, idque ad omnem rem, in quam cadere possit sententia, transferri significatur. Itaque *quis*, particula *que* adjuncta, non hominum incertum quendam, sed omnem, ad quem pertinere possit sententia, notat. Ab *omnis* igitur ita differt, ut hoc quidem cunctos simul significet, *quisque* autem distributionem quandam exprimat." Referring to the comparison made above between the Roman affix, and the Greek -κα, κεν, or ἄν appended to relatives in general expressions, it is clear that the only principle, which will explain all the facts, is that which lies at the basis of the true theory respecting these Greek particles. Now it appears that ἄν and κεν are connected with the second pronominal element, and therefore claim the same pedigree as the relative pronouns. But they are not only immediately attached to the relative word in the hypothesis or protasis, as in ὅταν, ἐάν, ὃς ἄν, &c., but also appear as antecedents or correlatives in the apodosis of a condition. In the latter case they can only be

considered as hints suggestive of the hypothetical or general nature of the whole sentence; for if I say λέγοιμ' ἄν, even without any condition expressed, the hearer feels that a condition is implied, which would not be the case if I had said λέξω. Such being the fact in regard to the apodosis, it is still more evident that the addition of a relative particle in the protasis, which is already a relative sentence, must add to the generality or comprehensiveness of the reference. And so we constantly find that the multiplication of relative or indefinite elements makes the range of supposition wider; and if *quis* means "any one," *quisque, quis-quis, qui-cun-que* will mean "any any" or "every possible" individual. This view is confirmed by the Semitic usages: for we not only find pronominal repetitions, such as מָה וּמָה = מָאוּמָה = *quid et quid*, but even repetitions of general terms, as אִישׁ וְאִישׁ = *vir et vir* = *quis-que*. In comparing *quisque* with *qui-cun-que* we observe, besides the constant distinction between *quis* and *qui*, that the latter is strengthened by the insertion of the temporal particle *cum;* and it is worthy of notice that not only is *cunque* used by itself as an expression of time; as in Hor. I. *Carm.* 32, 15: "mihi *cunque* salve rite vocanti," where *cunque* = *quoque tempore;* but we even find it after *cum*, as in Lucretius, II. 113: "contemplator enim, *cum* solis lumina *cunque* inserti fundunt radii per opaca domorum." *Us-que* for *cus-que* (cf. *us-piam, us-quam*) is only a different inflexion of the same elements as *cun-que*, for *us-que* and *un-quam* both refer to time, (see Schmidt, l. l. p. 96); and *quo-que* "too," "still," "continuing that state of things," must also be regarded as a particle of time, like its synonym *etiam* = *et jam*[1].

As the latter part of the words *quis-que, quis-quis, qui-cunque* is manifestly of relative import no less than the affix of *quis-quam*, it is clear that the absolute difference in meaning between these words, and between *us-que* and *un-quam, us-quam*, cannot depend upon the etymology of the suffix. If we compare *tam, quam* with *tum, quum*, we shall see that while the former pair refer to *manner*, the latter imply *time*. As *dies* signifying a particular day is always masculine, and as we have a number of adverbs counting time by days, as *pridie, hodie, nudius tertius,*

[1] For the parallelism and difference of *quoque* and *etiam* see Plaut. *Trin.* IV. 3, 42: "illis *quoque* abrogant *etiam* fidem."

diu, interdiu, &c., it is fair to conclude that *tum, quum* mean "on the particular day," "on which day;" and the same explanation will apply to *olim,* "on that day." Similarly, as the Greek adverbs in -η are properly explained by an ellipse of ὁδῷ signifying "way," "process," "manner," and as we have the adverbs *obviam, perviam* signifying directions or modes of motion, it may be inferred that there is an ellipse of *viam* in *tam, quam,* which would at once explain their meaning. If we apply the same explanation to *quis-quam,* we shall see that it means "any one in any way," *i. e.* "any one at all," which is always its distinctive meaning; for *quisquam* can only be used in a negative or conditional sentence, where all are excluded, or where the range of choice is circumscribed between the narrowest possible limits. Hence in Terence (*Eunuch. prol.* 1) we have: "*si quisquam est*—in his poeta his nomen profitetur suum"—"if there is any person at all, if there is any one person in all the world"—where the number is especially limited. Hence *unus* is often appended to *quisquam* (cf. Liv. XXVIII. 37, where *quisquam unus* is opposed to *alii omnes,* and II. 9, where *quisquam unus* is opposed to *universus senatus*). Hence also *ullus=unulus,* "a little one," "a mere one," serves as the adjective of *quisquam,* which, as we have seen, has no feminine or plural forms, though it occurs occasionally with feminine nouns. The exclusive force of *unus* and *ullus* is well shown by the modern French *aucun = aliquis unus,* which performs all the functions of *quispiam,* although the first word belongs to the most definite of these general pronouns. Thus *non vidi quenquam* might be rendered *je n'ai vu personne,* or *aucune personne.* And in English we sometimes use the word "single" for the purpose of excluding all of the kind—as, "I have not a single shilling." Opposed as *quisquam* is to *quis-quis,* it is very strange that no editor should have observed its intrusion into the place of the latter in a passage of Ovid (*Fast.* V. 21):

> Sæpe *aliquis* solio, quod tu, Saturne, tenebas,
> Ausus de media plebe sedere deus;
> Et latus Oceano *quisquam* deus advena junxit:
> Tethys et extremo sæpe recepta loco est.

It is obvious that *quisquam* is inadmissible, and that we must read *quisquis,* with the punctuation: *et latus Oceano, quisquis deus advena, junxit,* i. e. "whatever god happened to come

up." Cf. Plaut. *Amph.* I. 1, 156 : *quisquis homo huc venerit, pugnos edet.*

§ 6. *Numerals and Degrees of Comparison.*

In regard to the general discussion of this part of the subject, I have nothing to add to the full investigation which it has received in the *New Crat.* Book II. ch. 2. For the sake of method, however, it will be desirable to mention a few facts referring more particularly to the Latin language. While *unus,* more anciently *œnus* or *oinos,* corresponds in origin to the Greek εἷς, ἑν-, Goth. *aina,* Celtic *aenn,* the Sanscrit *êka* is represented only by the adjective *æquus.* We have ἑν-, with ς instead of the aspirate, in *sem-el, sim-plex, sem-per,* and *sin-gulus.* The ordinal *primus* is derived from the preposition *præ,* just as the Greek πρῶτος comes from πρό. All the ordinals end in *-mus* (which is perhaps contained in *octavus* for *octau-mus, nonus* for *novimus*), with the exception of *secundus,* "following," which is merely the participle of *sequor,* and of *tertius, quartus, quintus, sextus,* which represent the Greek -τος. In *tertius* this ending is lengthened by the qualitative or possessive *-ius,* so that *ter-t-ius* is a derivative of *ter-tus,* and the same is the case in the Sanscrit *dvi-tîyas, tritîyas,* and in the Sclavonic *tretii,* fem. *tretiza.* The Sclavonic relative *kotoroia* exhibits a similar extension of a form corresponding to κότερος. By the side of *duo* we have *ambo,* which is nearly synonymous with *uterque.* The distinction of these words is well known. While *duo* merely denotes an aggregate of two individuals—the number "two"—*ambo* signifies "both *together,*" and *uterque,* "both the one and the other." This is clear from such passages as the following; Ter. *Adelph.* I. 2, 50 :

> Curemus æquam *uterque* partem; tu alterum,
> Ego alterum: nam *ambos* curare propemodum
> Reposcere illum est, quem dedisti.

"Let *both the one and the other of us* look to his own : for to concern yourself with *both together* is almost to demand back again the boy whom you gave me." Auson. *Ep.* 91 : "vis *ambas* ut amem? si diligit *utraque* vellem." "Do you wish me to love *both together?* If both the one and the other loves me, I should be glad to do so." Hence it is clear that, as Döderlein says (*Lat. Et. u. Syn.* IV. 349), *ambo* regards the *two* as *two halves,*

but *uterque* as two *integral unities:* and the former corresponds to ἄμφω, the latter to ἑκάτερος, and both in different cases to ἀμφότερος. The separability of the two constituent units in *uterque* is farther shown by the fact that this word may have either a singular or plural verb, whereas *ambo* always takes the plural.

The formation of the degrees of comparison in adjectives and adverbs is intimately connected with that of the numerals. For all ordinals are of the nature of superlatives, and the most genuine form of the comparative in the Indo-Germanic languages is the combination of pronominal elements, which forms the third numeral, considered as indicating something *beyond* two. Although the Latin language is almost the only idiom which exhibits the full development of the separate usage of the form *ter=ta-ra* (*New Crat.* § 157), for it has not only the numeral under the forms *tres, ter, ter-nio, ter-tius,* but also a noun *terminus,* and a regular preposition *trans,* it does not use *-ter* as a comparative suffix except in the case of pronominal forms. For all common words we have instead of *-ter,* -τερος, *-taras,* which are so common in cognate languages, either the merely relative adjective in *-ius,* corresponding to the Sanscrit *-îyas,* Greek -ιος, or a derivative from this in *-ior,* corresponding to the Sanscrit *-îyâns,* Greek -ιων = -ιον-ς. Thus we have both *al-ter* and *al-ius,* and from the same root *ul-tra, ul-tro.* Many prepositions have a fixed or adverbial form in *-tra,* which is extended by the addition of *-ior* into an inflected comparative. Thus we have *ci-tra, ci-ter-ior, ex-tra, ex-ter-ior, in-tra, in-ter-ior, ul-tra, ul-ter-ior,* &c. The forms *an-ter-ior, de-ter-ior, pos-ter-ior,* show that there must have been originally derivatives like *an-tra, de-tra, pos-tra,* as well as the existing *an-te, de, pos-t*[*e*]*;* and we have seen that *pos-tro* is still extant in Umbrian. In some words the original affix was *-ra* only, as in *inf-ra, sup-ra,* whence *inferior, superior.* Some prepositions have no intermediate adverb in *-tra* or *-ra,* but merely add the termination *-ior,* as *prior* from *præ, propior* from *prope;* and to this class we must add *pejor* for *pes-ior,* from *per.* All regular adjectives form their comparative in this way—namely, by adding *-ior* to the crude form of the positive, as *dur-us, dur-ior, facil-is, facil-ior,* or, if the adjective involves a verbal root, from the crude form of the participle; thus, the comparative of *maledicus*

is not *maledicior*, but *maledicent-ior*. There is no doubt that *al-ius* and *med-ius* are comparative words. The regular comparative in *-ior*, gen. *-iōris*, is formed from the genitive of these forms, as appears from the Sanscrit *-îyans*, Gr. *-ιων=-ιον-ς* (*New Crat.* § 165). As the ordinal admits of two forms in *-tus* and in *-mus*, and as the superlative is of the nature of an ordinal, we should expect that it would be indicated by one or both of these terminations. And this is the case. We have *-mus* alone in *pri-mus*, *extre-mus*, *postre-mus*, *infi-mus* or *īmus*, and *sum-mus* for *supi-mus*. We have *-ti-mus* in *ul-timus*, in *op-timus*, "uppermost," from *ob*, in *in-timus*, "most inward," from *in*, in *pes-simus* (for *pes-timus*) "most down," from *per* (cf. *pessum-do* with *per-do*, and *per-eo*). The termination *-timus* is universally assimilated in the superlatives of ordinary adjectives. For these superlatives are formed, like the comparatives in *-tra*, *-τερος*, from an adverbial form, and not from the crude form of the adjective, like the comparatives in *-ior* (see *New Crat.* § 165; *Gr. Gr.* Art. 269, sqq.). The adverb derived from the adjectives in *-us* or *-er*, which ended in *e* or *o* in ordinary Latin, originally terminated in *-ed;* and as the supines in *-tum* of dental verbs generally changed their *t* into *s*, or, in combination with the characteristic, into *-ss*, we are not at a loss to account for the similar phenomenon in the superlatives: for *cessum=ced-tum* from *cedo*, and *sessum=sed-tum* from *sedeo*, fully correspond to *dur-i-ssimus* from *dured-timus*, and *moll-i-ssimus* from *mollid-timus*. The change of *e* into *i* in the former case is in accordance with the usual practice; cf. *teneo*, *con-tineo*, *sedeo*, *assideo*, &c. When the crude form of the adjective ends in *l* or *r*, the *t* of *-timus* is assimilated to this letter: thus from *celer* we have *celer-rimus* for *celer-timus*, from *facilis* we have *facil-limus* for *facil-timus*. The junction between the crude form of the adjective and an affix properly appended to a derived adverb is due to the fact that adjectives of this kind may use their neuter and even their crude form as adverbs; thus we have not only *faciliter*, but *facile*, and even *facul* (Festus, p. 87, Müller).

§ 7. *Prepositions.*

The most important of the pronominal adverbs, which are used as the basis of degrees of comparison, are the prepositions.

One of these, *trans*, is merely an extension of the affix of the comparative, and they are all employed more or less in qualifying those expressions of case, on which the mutual relations of words so much depend. We have seen that, according to the proper and original distinctions of the oblique cases, the genitive or ablative (for they were originally identical) denotes motion *from* a place, or, generally, separation; the dative or locative implies rest *in* a place, or, generally, conjunction; and the accusative signifies motion *to* a place, or, generally, approach with a view to conjunction; but that these primitive uses of the oblique inflexions have become obsolete in Latin, with the exception of a few general nouns and the proper names of cities. In other instances, motion *from* and *to*, and rest *in* a place, together with the other mutual relations of words, are expressed by some preposition; and in this use of the prepositions, the genitive, as distinct from the ablative, and the dative, whether identified with the locative or distinguished from it, are utterly excluded. The ablative alone is used with those prepositions which signify separation, and takes the place of the dative or locative with those which imply rest or conjunction, while the accusative properly accompanies those which denote approach or motion.

It will be convenient to class the Latin prepositions under three heads, corresponding to the three primitive distinctions of the oblique cases—namely, *separation* or motion *from*, rest *in*, and *approach* or motion *to*. To each of these may be appended the derived or compounded prepositions, which introduce some new modification of meaning.

The three simplest auxiliaries of the primitive relations of case are *ab* (shortened in *ā*, and extended into *abs*, *absque*) for the expression of *separation* or motion *from*, with the ablative; *in* for the expression of rest *in* or *on*, with the ablative, as the usurper of the place of the dative or locative; and *ad* for the expression of *approach* or motion *to* with the accusative.

There is no doubt as to the origin and linguistic affinities of these prepositions. *Ab* or *abs* corresponds in etymology and meaning to the Greek, ἀπὸ or ἄψ, which was originally ἀν-πός, or να-πός (*New Crat.* § 169), and, as such, denoted motion from a distant object to the subject, according to the principle which I have stated and elucidated elsewhere (*New Crat.* §§ 130, 169; *Gr. Gr.* Art. 77). Practically *ab* and ἀπὸ denote motion from the

surface of an object, and are so distinguished from *ex* (*e*), ἐξ (ἐκ), which imply that we pass through intermediate proximity; *in* corresponds in use to the Greek ἐν and εἰς = ἐνς, and in origin not only to these prepositions, but also to ἀνά. *In* with the ablative and ἐν with the dative express the simplest and most elementary notion of locality—the being *in* a place. With the accusative, *in* signifies *into* or *unto* a place, deriving the expression of motion from the case with which it is connected. When ἐν is connected with the accusative in this sense, it is always expanded to εἰς = ἐνς, except in some of the lyric poets, such as Pindar, who, like the Romans, use ἐν to express both location with the dative and motion with the accusative. There is no doubt that ἐν, εἰν, εἰνί, ἀνά, ἴνα, are ultimately identical, the original form having been Fα-να, which expresses motion through the nearer to the more distant object. Practically, *in* represents all the uses of ἐν, εἰς, ἀνά, and even of the negative prefix which corresponds to the last. Thus we have ἀνὰ μέρος = *in-vicem*, ἐν τῇ πόλει = *in urbe*, εἰς τὴν πόλιν = *in urbem*, ἀν-ήριθμος = *in-numerus*. The preposition *ad* is obviously another form of the conjunctions *at* = "still," and *et* = "too," "and." The late Professor Hunter showed[1] that there was the same relation between the Greek δέ, which signifies "too," "in the second place," and the affix -δε, as in οἰκόν-δε, "to-home," implying motion to a place. We learn from the other form εἶ-τα (*New Crat.* § 193) that ἔ-τι is compounded of the second element Fα, and the third; consequently it corresponds in etymology, as it does pretty nearly in meaning, to the Greek εἰς = ἐνς, and to *in* used with the accusative.

In its use with the ablative of the agent, *ab* corresponds rather to the Greek ὑπό, than to ἀπό. Thus: *mundus a deo creatus est* would be rendered ὁ κόσμος ὑπὸ (not ἀπὸ) τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκτίσθη. But we are not to conclude from this that ὑπό, ἀπό, are different forms of the same word. The *u* is found in all the cognate words ὑπό, *sub*, ὑπέρ, *super*, *subter*, *uf*, *ufar*, *upa*, *upari*; and it is clear that while ἀ-πό = να-πό, is compounded of the third and first, ὑ-πό = Fα-πό is made up of the second and first pronominal elements, and so denotes a passage

[1] *A Grammatical Essay on the nature, import, and effect, of certain Conjunctions; particularly the Greek δέ:* read June 21, 1784. *Trans. of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, Vol. I. pp. 113—34.

to the subject from that which is proximate or under the feet. As the act of separation implies nearness at the moment of separation, we find that idiomatically *ab* is used to express relative positions, as: *a fronte*, "in front," *a tergo*, "behind," *libertus a manu*, "a freedman at hand," i. e. an *amanuensis*. But this meaning is more fully expressed by *ap-ud*, compounded of *ab* and *ad*, and combining the meaning of these two prepositions; for *apud* signifies "being by the side of but not part of an object," and this implies both juxta-position and separation. It is used with the accusative, because this is the case of the latter preposition of the two, and because the passage from *ab* to *ad* implies motion. The Greek παρά, which answers exactly to *apud*, takes different cases according to the meaning implied by the special reference (*Gr. Gr.* Art. 485). In low Latin we have the compound *ab-ante* from which comes the French *a-vant*, and even *de-ab-ante* from whence comes *devant* (see Pott, *Zeitschr. f. d. Vergl. Sprf.* I. p. 311).

The preposition *in* has also the comparative forms *in-ter* and *in-tra*, or *in-fra*, which imply motion, and are consequently joined to the accusative. The same is the case with *an-te*, which retains the *a* found in *an-ter*, Sanscr. *an-tar*, Gr. ἄ-τερ for ἄν-τερ (*New Crat.* § 204). In meaning *an-te* corresponds to the Greek ἀν-τί only so far as the latter signifies "in front of," which is the primitive signification of the Latin particle. The Greek πρό, from whence comes πρός, or προτί, claims a common origin with *pro;* and there can be no doubt as to the connexion between παρά, whence παραί, and *præ;* but there are many shades of meaning in which the Latin and Greek terms by no means coincide. *Præ-ter*, which is a comparative of *præ*, and *prop-ter*, which is similarly formed from *pro-pe*, an extension of *pro* (above, § 5), express exactly certain meanings of παρά: thus παρὰ δόξαν = *præter opinionem*, and παρὰ ταῦτα = *propter ista*. *Per* exactly answers to παρά, in its negative or depreciating sense, in compounds such as *pe-jero* for *per-juro* = παρορκέω: cf. *pejor* for *perior*. Although *per* and περὶ are identical words, there are only some few cases in which their significations strictly correspond (see *New Crat.* §§ 177, 8). It is perhaps still more difficult to show the exact relation in meaning between the Greek and Latin affix *-περ, -per:* cf. ἄπερ, ὅσαπερ, &c. with *paullisper, nuper*, &c. In many of its employments the Latin

per coincides exactly with the Greek διά, which, with the genitive, and, in the older poets, with the accusative also, signifies "through," and which, with the accusative in ordinary Greek, corresponds to the use of παρά, *propter*, to which I have just adverted. Etymologically there can be no doubt that διὰ finds a representative in the Latin *de*, which implies descent and derivation, and is of course used with the ablative. It has been remarked already, that *ab* differs from *ex*, the other preposition most directly connected with the meaning of the ablative, by referring to the surface of the object from which the separation takes place, whereas *ex* denotes a removal from or out of the interior of the object or objects. Now *de* also presumes that the thing removed was a part of the object from which it is removed. Thus while we have no *ab-imo* from *emo*, we have both *ex-imo*, "to take out," and *dēmo*, "to take away a part" (as *partem solido demere de die*), to say nothing of *sumo*, "to take up," *promo*, "to take forth," which imply approximation to the same idea of partition. This signification of partition brings us back very closely to the primitive meaning of διά, δίς, δύο; and we have absolute division in such phrases as *dedi de meo*. From the same idea of partition we may get the sense of derivation and descent implied in these and other compounds of *de*. And here *de* comes into close contact with the affixes *-θεν*, *-tus*, which undoubtedly belong to the same original element (see *New Crat.* § 263); thus *de cœlo* is exactly equivalent to *cœli-tus*. While διά corresponds to *per* in its sense of "through," and to *de* in its meaning of division into parts, we find that *de* conversely coincides with περὶ in the sense of "about," "concerning," as denoting the subject from which the action or writing is derived, *i. e.* the source of agency or the subject-matter (ὕλη). Thus *scripsit de republica* means "he took the subject of his writing from the general theme of the commonwealth;" for which a Greek would have said: ἔγραψε περὶ τῆς πολιτείας, *i. e.* "his writing was about or derived from the republic." The connexion of *de* and διὰ is seen still more plainly in the form *di* or *dis* which the former bears in composition.

As *de*, though connected with διά, thus corresponds to one of the uses of περί, while διὰ in its general meaning coincides with *per*, so we find that *ob*, which is etymologically identical with ἀμφί, a synonym of περί, agrees in one of its uses with

propter, and so with διά when used with the accusative. The fact, that *ob* may be traced to a common origin with ἐπὶ and ἀμφί, has been elsewhere established (*New Crat.* §§ 172, 3), by the following proofs. There can be no doubt as to the identity of ἐπὶ with the Sanscrit *api* and *abhi*. Now *abhi* is related to ἀμφί, as *abhra* is to ὄμβρος, *abhau* to ἄμφω, *ambo*, &c. And the analogy of ἀπὸ for ἀν-πό, shows that ἐπὶ must originally have been ἐν-πὶ or ἀν-πί = ἀμ-φί. Moreover ἐπί and ἀμφί concur not only in their ordinary meanings, but especially in that sense of interchange or reciprocity which I have claimed for ἐπί (*New Crat.* § 174). Now *ob*, which resembles the Sanscrit *abhi* in its *auslaut*, shows by its vowel the last trace of a lost nasal; comp. *obba*, *umbo*, ἄμβιξ. And its usage, in other senses than that of *propter*, indicates a close connexion in meaning with ἐπὶ and ἀμφί. Thus *op-timus* from *ob* manifestly denotes "up-most" or "upper-most." So that *ob* must have denoted "superposition" or "relative altitude" like ἐπί. And Festus (p. 178, Müller) has pointed out usages in which it concurs with the two Greek prepositions: "*ob* præpositio alias ponitur pro *circum* (i. e. ἀμφί), ut cum dicimus *urbem ob-sideri, ob-vallari, ob-signari* . . . alias pro *ad* (i. e. ἐπί) ponitur, ut Ennius: *ob Romam noctu legiones ducere cœpit*, et alibi *ob Trojam duxit.*" The relative altitude implied by ἐπί and *ob* is shown in such phrases as *ob oculos*, "before the eyes," i. e. on a level with them; and in Ennius' *Telamo* we have more generally *ob os* (Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* III. 18): *hicine est ille Telamo . . . cujus ob os Graii ora obvertebant sua*, where the compound reminds us of Æschyl. *Choëph.* 350: ἐπι-στρεπτὸς αἰών. The frequentative sense of ἐπὶ is conveyed by *obeo*, ἐπιφοιτάω, "to go backwards and forwards," and the relative height of a table, or city built on the level surface of a hill, is signified by *oppidum* = ἐπίπεδον (Virg. *Georg.* II. 156: *tot congesta manu præruptis oppida saxis*). The phrases quoted by Festus for the sense of *circum* remind us at once of ἐπὶ and περὶ or ἀμφί. Thus *obsidere* is either ἐφέζεσθαι or περικαθῆσθαι. If *obscurus* reminds us of ἐπίσκιος, we have ἀμφικαλύπτω in *oc-culo*; if *ob-edio* suggests ἐπακούω, *ob-esus* (*bassus*) refers us to ἀμφιλαφής, *ob-erro* to περιπλανῶμαι, and *ob-liquus* to ἀμφίλοξος. The sense of perseverance or continuance conveyed by *oc-cupo*, *ob-tineo*, and *obs-tinatus* (see Ruhnken, *Dictata in Terentium*, p. 78), is also due to the meaning of

surrounding or going backwards and forwards contained in ἐπὶ and ἀμφί (περί). For example, *oc-cupo* is either ἐπιλαμβάνω or περιλαμβάνω. The preposition *circum* (*circa*, *circiter*), which is limited to the local or temporal meaning of περί, is a case of the substantive *circus*, which may be connected with *cis* (*citra*), a form of the pronominal element *-ce;* and *ci-tra*, *citro* are opposed to *ul-tra*, *ul-tro*, as *ce* = "here" is opposed to *ul-* (*al-*, *an-*, *il-*, *in-*) ="there," and there is no doubt that the preposition *in* is ultimately identical with the pronoun *ul-*, *al-* (cf. Sanscr. *anya*, Greek κεῖνος, &c.). The pronominal root *ce* obtains another prepositional extension in *cum* = ξύν, and this again has its comparative in *con-tra*, "against," implying extension from and in front of that which is here. The first element *po-* combined with the second *-s* and the third *-n* gives in *po*[*s*]*ne* a sense of extension "backwards" and "behind," i.e. through all three positions; and this is also the meaning of *pos-t*, which bears the same relation to *pô-ne* that *se-d* or *se-t* does to *si-ne*. The latter, which is really *po-s-ne* without the first syllable, expresses the idea of simple separation. The compound *post*, or even the syllable *po* alone, is used as a preposition almost equivalent to *trans*, as in *po-mœrum* or *post-mœrium*, "the space beyond the wall," *post-liminium*, "the space beyond the threshhold, within which a resumption of civic rights is possible." *Trans*, involving the elements of the comparative suffix, with a new affix, differs little from *ul-tra*, for it includes nearly the same elements in a different order. As *cir-cus* is probably connected with *cis*, so *terminus* undoubtedly contains the root of *tr-ans*. A *finis* or *terminus* strictly excludes the *citra* as well as the *ultra*, and the *circus*, as a line, is neither the space, which it encloses, nor that, which it shuts out. *Erga*, which bears the same relation to *ergo* that *ultra* does to *ultro*, must be explained by the correspondence of *ergo* and *igitur*. The latter, as we have seen, is an extension in *-tur* = *-tus* of *i-gi* = *es-gi;* and *erg-a* = *esg-a* is only a different form of the same word; for the ending of *igi-tur* is *-tur* = *-tim*, and while *circa* stands by *circi-ter* we shall see directly that *juxta* presumes a *juxtatim*.

It has been shown (in Chapter VIII.) that *clam*, *coram*, *penes* and *tenus* are adverbs derived from nominal or verbal roots; and *juxta*=*jug-sta* is a compound of the root *jug-* in *jungo*, *jugum*, *jugis*, and the crude form of *sto*. Like *con-tinuo*

it expresses contiguity. Some consonantal affix, equivalent to a case-ending, is involved in the last syllable. The old grammarians remark that "*statim* pro *firmiter* primam producit; pro *illico* corripit;" and such forms as *stătio*, &c., prove that the contraction is not always exhibited. But the analogy of *ἀνα-μίγ-δην*, *ἀνα-μίγ-δα*, *ἀνά-μιγα*, *ἀνά-μιξ* (*Greek Grammar*, Art. 265), shows that some affix was to be expected, and that it might be extenuated into a mere vocal *auslaut*. From the almost synonymous *tenus* and *ἐξῆς*, compared with the ablatives in *â* for *ad*, and with *ergā* by the side of *igi-tur*, we can easily infer the nature of the appendage which has been rubbed off from the prepositional adverb *jug-sta* = *jug-sta-tim*.

It may be worth while to add that prepositions compounded with verbs are liable to certain changes from assimilation or absorption, which perhaps typify a similar change in the separate use of these proclitic words.

A, ab, abs may appear as *au*, and we have seen it assume the form *af* in old Latin (above, p. 221).

Ad may change *d* into the first letter of the word with which it is compounded; thus it may become *ac, af, ag, al, an, ap, ar, as, at;* and we have seen that the last of these represents one of its separate usages; compare also *et*, and the Greek *ἔτι*.

Ante sometimes appears as *antid*, which may have been its original form (see above, p. 306).

Circum may lose its final *m* or change it into *n*.

Cum appears as *com, co, col, con*, or *cor*.

De either remains unaltered, or assumes the form *des* before *t;* it is found also with a different, but cognate signification, as *dis-, di-, dif-* and *dir-*.

E, ex, enters into compounds either in its separate form, or assimilated to *f-*, as in *ef-fero*.

In is *im* before labials, *i* before *g, il* and *ir* before the liquids *l* and *r*, but otherwise unchanged; in old writers or their imitators we have *endo* or *indu*.

Inter is not changed, except before *l*, when it becomes *intel-*.

Ob becomes *obs* before dentals, it is assimilated to labials and gutturals, and is shortened into *ŏ* before *m;* sometimes it resumes its original *m:* thus we have *amb*, shortened into *am*, or *an* before *c*, as in *an-ceps*.

Per is sometimes, but not always, assimilated to *l*.

Post, or *pone*, becomes *po*, in *pomœrium, pomeridianus.*

Pro is written *prod* before a vowel, as in *prod-est;* it suffers metathesis in *pol-liceo, por-rigo*, where it approaches to the cognate *per*, if it is not identical with it.

The inseparable *re*, really a form of *in=ἀνά*, is written *red* before a vowel, or the dentals *d, t;* compare *red-eo, red-do, ret-tuli.*

Sine, or *sed*, appears only as *sē.*

Sub may change *b* to the following letter, and sometimes assumes *s* before *t*, as in *subs-traho.*

Trans may be shortened into *tra.*

Ve, or *vehe*, is not a preposition, but a particle containing the same root as *via=veha, veho, weg*, &c.

§ 8. *Negative Particles.*

Negative particles fall into two main classes essentially different in signification; for they denote either *denial*, which is categorical negation, or *prohibition*, which is hypothetical negation; in the former case, we negative an affirmation, i. e. affirm that the case is not so; in the latter, we negative a supposition, i. e. prohibit or forbid an assumed or possible event. As these differences are absolute in logic or syntax, it is necessary that they should be expressed by the forms of the words; and the three classical languages have sufficient, but by no means identical, methods of conveying these distinctions. The Greek language expresses categorical negation by the particle *οὐ* or *οὐ-κ*, amounting to *ἀ-να-Fα-κ*, which denotes distance and separation, but takes for the expression of a prohibition or negative hypothesis the particle *μή*, which is connected with the first personal pronoun, and is therefore opposed to *οὐκ* as subject is to object (*New Crat.* § 189). The Hebrew language has the same root לֹ, which is ultimately identical with the Indo-Germanic *na* or *a-na*, to express both negation and prohibition; but while the categorical negative לֹא conveys this idea by a lengthened stress on the vowel which follows the liquid, the hypothetical אַל denotes the prohibition of an act present or intended by an initial breathing which throws the emphasis on the *anlaut* (*Maskil le-Sopher*, p. 15). The Latin language, like the Hebrew, contents itself with one pronominal element, namely, *n'*, signifying "distance" and "separation," for both negation and

prohibition, but distinguishes these in form by adopting a compound or lengthened word for the categorical negative, while the hypothetical word appears without any such strengthening addition. Thus, while the common expression for the categorical negative is *non* for *nenu* or *nœnu*, which is obviously *ne œnum* or *ne unum* with the ecthlipsis of the final *m*, we find merely *ne* in the prohibitive sense, in ordinary Latin. There are traces in single words and in the older authors of a strengthening affix *c* in this latter use (above, p. 98), corresponding to the affix which appears in *οὐ-κ* or *οὐ-χί*. We must distinguish this affix from the conjunction *-que*, which appears in the disjunction *ne-que* (Müller, *Suppl. Ann. ad Fest.* p. 387). If, then, we compare *οὐ-κ* = *ἀ-να-*F*α-κ* with *ne-c*, we shall see that they differ only in the inserted element F*α*, and there is no reason to suppose that the categorical *n'on* differs from the hypothetical *ne*, otherwise than by the strengthening word *unum*, which is also involved in *nullus* = *n'unu-lus*. On the other hand, we see from the categorical use of *n'unquam, n'usquam, ne-quidem* and *neque*, that the negative *ne* may always be used in a denial of facts, if it is only sufficiently strengthened. The identity of *ἀ-να-*[F*α*]*-κ* and *ne-c* is farther shown by the use of the negative as a prefix in Latin. Of this we have three forms; the simple *ne* or *nĭ* as in *ne-fas, ne-scio, ni-hil, ni-si*, &c.; the same with *i* = F*α* prefixed, as in *in-iquus, in-numerus, im-mensus, i-gnavus*, &c.; with *c* affixed, as in *nec-opinus, neg-otium, neg-ligo* or *nec-ligo*. As it is quite clear that in these instances the element *n* is that which gives the negative force, and as this element is common to *n'on* and *ne*, it follows that the Romans did not distinguish between the form of the prohibition and categorical negation otherwise than by strengthening the latter. And this extenuation of the negative emphasis in subordinate expressions is also shown by the fact, that, in conditional and final sentences, the mere diminution of assertion expressed by *minus* took the place of the shorter negative; thus we have *si minus* for *sin*, and *quominus* for *quin*. It is a question whether the shorter form *ne* can appear without some strengthening affix, as *-dum, -que*, or *quidem*, in the categorical negation. Of the passages quoted some are manifestly corrupt, and it seems that *ne* is not used categorically, except when it stands for *ne-quidem*, "not even" (see Drakenborch, *ad Liv.* VIII. 4; XXXIII. 49). It may be

doubted in these cases whether there is not a concealed prohibition, as in the Greek *μὴ ὅτι*. On the other hand, when *non* appears, as it occasionally does, in a final sentence, there is always some reason for the employment of this more emphatical particle. Thus *ne plura dicam*, or *ut ne plura dicam*, means merely "not to say more," but *ut plura non dicam neque aliorum exemplis confirmem* (Cic. *pro lege Manil.* 15, § 44) implies a more deliberate abstinence from irrelevant details. The difference between *ne-quidem* and *non-quidem* or *nec-quidem* consists in the greater degree of emphasis conveyed by the former, which is much the more usual combination; for *ne-quidem* means "not even;" but *non* (or *nec*) *-quidem* denotes merely a qualification of opposed terms, so that *quidem* is simply the Greek *μέν*: this appears from Quintilian's rendering (IX. 3, § 55) of Demosthenes (*de Coronâ*, p. 288): *οὐκ εἶπον μὲν ταῦτα, οὐκ ἔγραψα δέ· οὐδ' ἔγραψα μέν, οὐκ ἐπρέσβευσα δέ· οὐδ' ἐπρέσβευσα μέν, οὐκ ἔπεισα δὲ Θηβαίους*,—"*non* enim dixi *quidem*, sed non scripsi; *nec* scripsi *quidem*, sed non obii legationem; *nec* obii *quidem*, sed non persuasi Thebanis:" (see Wagner on Virg. *Georg.* I. 126).

This distinction in emphasis regulates the employment of the negative particles in interrogations, and we observe the same relation between the Greek and Latin particles in this use also—that is, we employ *nonne* in Latin, where we write *ἆρ' οὐ* in Greek; *num*, which bears the same relation to *ne* that *ipsus* does to *ipse* or *necessum* to *necesse*, corresponds to the Greek use of *μὴ* or *μὴ οὖν*=*μῶν*; and the enclitic *-nĕ* is used when no negation appears in Greek; thus we have: *ἆρ' οὐκ ἔστιν ἀσθενής*; =*nonne ægrotat?* when we expect an affirmative answer; *ἆρα μή ἐστιν ἀσθενής*; or *μῶν ἀσθενής ἐστι*;=*num ægrotat?* when we expect a negative answer; and *ἆρα ἀσθενής ἐστι*; =*ægrotatne?* when we merely ask for information. The employment of the negative in the final sentence really emanates from this use in interrogations, coupled with the prohibitive value of the shorter particle. (See *Complete Greek Grammar*, Art. 538.) The subordinate sentence, whether affirmative or negative, is generally coupled with that on which it depends by some relative or interrogative particle. In Greek this particle cannot be dispensed with, except in those cases, when the thing feared, denied, or doubted, is expressed by a prohibitive sentence, and here the

usual form of the final or illative sentence is relinquished; but the use of ὥστε μὴ (*Gr. Gr.* Art. 602) shows that this is merely an idiomatic omission, and δέδοικα μὴ θάνω might have been written δέδοικα, ὡς μὴ θάνω, or ὥστε μὴ θανεῖν, "I fear with a view to the result that I may not die." The examples collected by Mr. Allen (*Analysis of Latin Verbs*, pp. 337, sqq.) sufficiently show that in Latin the relative particle *ut* may be either inserted or omitted at pleasure, whether the subordinate sentence is affirmative or negative.

CHAPTER XI.

THE THEORY OF THE LATIN VERB.

§ 1. The Latin verb generally defective. § 2. The personal inflexions—their consistent anomalies. § 3. Doctrine of the Latin tenses. § 4. The substantive verbs. § 5. Paucity of organic formations in the regular Latin verb. § 6. General scheme of tenses in the Latin verb. § 7. Verbs which may be regarded as parathetic compounds. § 8. Tenses of the vowel-verbs which are combinations of the same kind. § 9. Organic derivation of the tenses in the consonant-verb. § 10. Auxiliary tenses of the passive voice. § 11. The modal distinctions—their syntax. § 12. Forms of the infinitive and participle—how connected in derivation and meaning. § 13. The *gerundium* and *gerundivum* shown to be active and present. § 14. The participle in *-turus*. § 15. The perfect subjunctive. § 16. The past tense of the infinitive active.

§ 1. *The Latin Verb generally defective.*

THE forms of the Latin verb are meagre and scanty in the same proportion as the cases of the nouns are multifarious and comprehensive. The deficiencies of the one are due to the same cause as the copiousness of the other. They both spring from the antiquated condition of the language. An idiom which has been long employed in literature will generally substitute prepositions for the inflexions of cases, and, by the employment of various syntactical devices, increase the expressiveness and significance of the verb. It is just in these particulars that the dialects formed from the Latin differ from their mother-speech, and in the same particulars they approximate to the syntactical distinctness of the Greek.

§ 2. *The Personal Inflexions—their consistent Anomalies.*

The Latin person-endings are, however, on the whole, less mutilated than the corresponding inflexions in the Greek verb. This is because the person-endings are, in fact, case-endings of pronouns, by virtue of which every form of the finite verb becomes complete in itself (see *New Crat.* § 347), and the case-endings, as has been already observed, are more perfect in Latin than in Greek.

The person-endings of the active verb, as they appear in classical Latin, are *-m, -s, -t ; -mus, -tis, -nt.* But these forms are not maintained throughout all the tenses. The present indicative has dropt the characteristic *-m*, except in the two cases

of *sum* and *inquam*. The sign of the first person singular is also wanting in the perfect indicative, and in the futures in *-bo* and *-ro*. The second person singular is represented by *-s* in every case but one—that of the perfect indicative, which substitutes *-sti*. The third singular is always *-t;* the first plural always *-mus;* the second plural always *-tis*, except in the perfect indicative, when it is *-stis*, to correspond with the singular of the same person; and the third plural is always *-nt*, though this is occasionally dropt in the third person plural of the perfect indicative. If we may judge from the *-to*, *-tote* of the imperative, these person-endings must have been originally ablative or causative inflexions of the pronouns. The original form of the imperative suffix in the singular number was *-tod* or *-tud*, which is unequivocally an ablative inflexion (above, Chap. VIII. § 8).

The person-endings of the passive verb present some difficulties to the inquiring philologist. In fact, only the third person, singular and plural, seems to have been preserved free from mutilation or suppression. The terminations of the passive should, according to the rules of sound philology, present themselves as inflexions or cases of the active person-endings. If, then, we compare the active *amat*, *amant*, *amare*, with the corresponding passive forms, *amatur*, *amantur*, *amarier*, we must conclude that *r*, connected with the active form by a short vowel, *e* or *u*, is the sign of the passive voice, and that this amounts to an inflexion of the active form analogous to the adverbs in *-ter* (*leni-ter*, *gnavi-ter*, &c.), *-tus* (*cæli-tus*, &c.), or *-tim* (*grada-tim*, &c.). In fact, the isolated particle *igi-tur* supplies a perfect analogy for the passive person-endings *-tur* and *-ntur*. This particle, as we have seen (above, pp. 289, 335), is an extension in *-tur* from the composite form *i-gi* (cf. *e-go*, *er-ga*, *e-ho*, *e-ja*), and it has the locative meaning "thereupon" in a Fragment of the XII. Tables (above, p. 204). We have also seen that the adverbs in *-ter*, *-tim* are used in a locative sense. And whether we conclude that *-tur* is a locative like τόθι, or identical with *-tus* = *-θεν*, and therefore bearing a locative meaning only as the act of separation implies proximity at the moment of separation (above, p. 330), there can be no doubt that it does bear that locative sense, which is required by the person-endings of the passive voice. The identity of *-tur* with *-ter* (*-tim*) is farther shown by the form *amari-er*, which stands by the side of *ama-tur*. According to

this, the first persons *amor* and *amamur* are contractions of *amŏmĕr*, *amāmŭsĕr*, according to the Sanscrit analogy (comp. *bharê* with *φέρομαι*, &c. *New Crat.* §§ 352, 362). The second persons, *amaris* (*amare*) and *amamini*, are altogether different forms; they seem to be two verbals, or participial nouns, of the same kind respectively as the Latin and Greek active infinitive, *amare* = *amase* (compare *dic-sis-se*, *es-se*, Gr. *γέλαϊς*, *ὕψοϊς*, &c.), and the passive participle *τυπτό-μενος*. The verbal, which stands for the second person singular of the passive verb, was probably, in the first instance, a verbal noun in *-sis;* compare *πρᾶξις*, *μίμη-σις*, &c. That which represents the second person plural is the plural of a form which is of very frequent occurrence in the Latin language (*New Crat.* § 362). The older form ended in *-minor*, and is preserved in the imperative, which in old Latin had a corresponding second person singular in *-mino:* thus we have *antestamino* (*Legg.* XII. *Tab.* I. Fr. 1, above, Ch. VI. § 7), *famino* (Fest. p. 87), *præfamino* (Cat. *R. R.* 135, 140), *fruimino* (*Inscr. Grut.*), for *antestare*, *fare*, *præfare*, *fruere;* as well as *arbitraminor* (Plaut. *Epid.* V. 2, 30) and *progrediminor* (id. *Pseud.* III. 2, 70) for *arbitramini* and *progredimini*. The use of these verbals, with a fixed gender, and without any copula, to express passive predications referring to the second person, is one of the most singular features in the Latin language, and the former can only be compared to the Greek use of the infinitive to express the second person imperative.

§ 3. *Doctrine of the Latin Tenses.*

There is, perhaps, no one department of classical philology, in which so little has been done as in the analysis and simplification of the Latin tenses. They are still arranged and designated as they were in the beginning; and no one seems to have discerned the glaring errors inseparable from such a system. Even among the more enlightened, it is not yet agreed whether certain tenses are to be referred to the indicative or to the subjunctive mood, and forms of entirely different origin are placed together in the same category.

Without anticipating the discussion of the difficulties which beset the doctrine of the Latin tenses, I will premise that, practically, the regular verb has four moods and five tenses, which are known by the following names, and represented, in my

Grammar, by the notation attached to the terminology: the *indicative* (A), *imperative* (B), *subjunctive* (C), and *infinitive* (D) moods, and the *present* (I), *imperfect* (II), *perfect* (III), *pluperfect* (IV), and *future* (V) tenses. Thus, to avoid repeating the names, A. III. will represent the *present indicative*, C. II. the *imperfect subjunctive*, and so on.

An accurate examination of all the forms in the Latin language will convince us that there are only two ways in which a tense can be formed organically from the root of a Latin verb. One is, by the addition of *s-*; the other, by the addition of *i-*. We find the same process in the Greek verb; but there it is regular and systematic, supplying us throughout with a complete series of primary and secondary, or definite and indefinite tenses[1]. In Greek, we say that the addition of σ- to the root forms the aorist and future, that the same adjunct in a more guttural form makes the perfect, and that the insertion of ι- indicates the conjunctive or optative mood. Moreover, we have in the Greek verb an augment, or syllable prefixed for the purpose of marking past time as such, and traces at least of the systematic employment of reduplication to designate the continuance of an action. As the ancient epic poetry of the Greeks neglects the augment, we may understand how it fell into desuetude among the Romans. The reduplication too, though common to all the old Italian languages, is of only partial application in the existing forms of the Latin verb. With regard to the value of the tenses in σ- and ι-, the same holds to a certain extent in Latin also; but while the principle is here susceptible of a double application, it is, on the other hand, interrupted by the operation of a system

---

[1] For the convenience of the reader, I will repeat here the distinctions which I have elsewhere quoted from J. L. Burnouf's *Méthode pour étudier la Langue Grecque*, pp. 215, sqq.

PRIMARY TENSES.

The Present expresses	*simultaneity*	with reference to the present time	*je lis*
The Future . . .	*posteriority*		*je lirai*
The Perfect . . .	*anteriority*		*j'ai lu.*

SECONDARY TENSES.

The Imperfect expresses	*simultaneity*	with reference to some other time	*je lisais*[1]
The Aorist	*posteriority*		*je lus*[2]
The Pluperfect . . .	*anteriority*		*j'avais lu*[3].

[1] pendant que vous écriviez. [2] après que vous eutes fini d'écrire.
[3] avant que vous eussiez écrit.

of composite tenses which is peculiar to the Latin language, and still more so by the irregular use of the affix *-s* to express derived or indefinite tenses.

§ 4. *The Substantive Verbs.*

Before I proceed to examine the tense-system of the Romans, as it appears in all the complications of an ordinary verb, it will be as well to analyse, in the first instance, the substantive verb which enters so largely into all temporal relations.

The Latin language has two verbs signifying "to be:" one contains the root *es-*, Sanscr. *as-*, Greek *εσ-*, Lith. *es-*; the other, the root *fu-*, Sancr. *bhû-*, Gr. *φυ-*, Lith. *bu-*.

The inflexions of *es-* are as follows:—

INDICATIVE PRESENT. A. I.

Actual form.	Ancient form.	Sanscrit.	Lithuanian.
'sum	*esum*[1]	*asmi*	*esmi*
es'	*essi*	*asi*	*essi*
es't	*esti*	*asti*	*esti, est*
'sumus	*esumus*	*smas*	*esma*
es'tis	*esitis*	*st'a*	*este*
'sunt	*esunt*	*santi*	[*esant ?*]

IMPERFECT. A. II.

Actual form.	Ancient form.	Sanscrit.
eram	*êsam*	*âsam*
eras	*êsas*	*âsîs*
erat	*êsat*	*âsît*
eramus	*êsamus*	*âsma*
eratis	*êsatis*	*âstâ*
erant	*êsant*	*âsan.*

FUTURE OR SUBJUNCTIVE, A. V. OR C. I,

Formed by the insertion of the guttural element *-i.*

Actual forms.			Ancient form.	Sanscrit.
ero,	*'sim,*	*'siêm*	*esyâm*	*syâm*
eris,	*'sis,*	*'siês*	*esyâs*	*syâs*
erit,	*'sit,*	*'siêt*	*esyât*	*syât*
erimus,	*'sîmus,*	*'siêmus*	*esyâmus*	*syâma*
eritis,	*'sîtis,*	*'siêtis*	*esyâtis*	*syâta*
erunt,	*'sint,*	*'siênt*	*esyânt*	*syus.*

[1] Varro, *L. L.* IX. 100, p. 231.

INDEFINITE OR PAST TENSE, C. II.,

Formed from the last by the addition of *-să*.

Actual form.	Ancient form.
es-sem	*es-sa-yam*
es-ses	*es-sa-yas*
&c.	&c.

INFINITIVE, D.,

Or locative of a verbal in *-sis*, expressing the action of the verb[1].

es-se.

PARTICIPLE. E.

Nom.	*'sen[t]s* (in *ab-sens*, *præ-sens*, &c.) originally	*esen[t]s*
Gen.	*'sentis*	*esentis*
	&c.	&c.

IMPERATIVE. B.

es,	*esto*	originally	*es,* *estod*
	esto		*estod*
este,	*estote*		*esite,* *esitote*
	sunto		*esunto.*

Throughout the Latin verb we may observe, as in the case of *ero* here, that the element *i* has vanished from the first person of the future; for *ero* does not really differ from *esum*, the present indicative. The explanation of this may be derived from the fact, that in English the first and the other persons of the future belong to different forms: where an Englishman says, "I shall" of himself, he addresses another with "you will;" and conversely, where he asserts of another that "he shall," he tells him, "I will." The third person plural *erunt* is only another way of writing *erint;* u_3 being substituted, as it so frequently is, for i_3, to which the qualifying *i* had been ultimately reduced. But besides the form of the future in *i*, we have in old Latin another expression of it in the inchoative form *esco* for *es-sco* (*Legg.* XII. *Tab. apud Gell.* XX. i. Tab. I. fr. 3: Lucret. I. 613: Festus, s. v. *escit*, p. 77; *superescit*, p. 302; *nec*, p. 162; *obescet*, p. 188: and Müller, *Suppl. Annot.* p. 386).

The verb *fu-*, which appears as a supplementary form or auxiliary tense of the substantive verb, is really a distinct verb,

[1] *New Crat.* § 410.

very complete in its inflexions, and connected by many interesting affinities with the other Indo-Germanic languages. It has been shown elsewhere that in these languages, the same root is used to express "light," or "brightness," and "speaking" (*New Crat.* § 460). To the idea of "light" belongs that of "manifestation," or "bringing to light," and this is simply the idea of "making," or "causing to be." Now the full form of the root *φα-, fa-, bhâ-*, which, in Greek, Latin, and Sanscrit, conveys the cognate expressions of "light" and "speech," involves what is called a digamma in *auslaut* as well as in *anlaut;* for we learn from the words *favonius, vapor,* &c. that the full forms must have been ϜάϜημι, φάϜος, &c. (*New Crat.* § 458). Now this full form is much more obvious in *φυ-, fac-*, signifying "to make," than in the roots which convey the other modifications of meaning; although *fax*, "a torch," and *facies*, "the countenance," contain the guttural at the end of the root, which appears in *facio,* and which is a residuum of the first constituent of the digamma, just as the *υ* in *φυ-* represents the ultimate form of the constituent labial. In the ordinary forms of the Greek, the transitive *φύω, φύσω, ἔφυσα*, does not seem to differ externally from the intransitive *ἔφυν* and *πέφυκα*. But we know from philological induction that the latter must have involved the element *ι = ya* (*New Crat.* § 380); and in old Greek we actually find the form *φυίω* corresponding to the Pelasgian *fuius* and the Greek *υἱός* (above, p. 169). The following table will show what remains of the Greek and Latin forms of *φυ = φαϜ*, and *fu = fac* for *faf*, "to bring to light," or "cause to be."

TRANSITIVE.

Pres.	*φύ-ω = φάϜα-μ*	A. I.	*fac-io*
Fut.	*φύ-σω*	A. V.	*fac-sim*
Aor.	*ἔ-φυ-σα*	A. V_2.	*[e]-fac-sim*
Perf.	. . . .	A. III.	*fe-faci* contr. *fēci.*

INTRANSITIVE WITH ADJUNCT *i.*

Pres.	*φυίω*	A. I.	*fio = fuio (-bo)*
Fut.	. . . .	A. V.	*forem = fu-sim.*
Aor.	*ἔφυν = ἔφυιαμ*	A. V_2.	*[e]-forem (-ebam)*
Perf.	*πέφυκα = πεφυίακα*	A. III.	*fui* or *fūvi = fufui,* sometimes *factus sum.*

PARTICIPLES. E.

φύς = φυ-ίαντ-ς	*fu-turus*
πεφυκώς	*fœtus = fui-tus*
	fœcundus = fui-scundus
υἱός = φυιϜότς	*fœminus = fui-minus* (cf. *fœmina*)
	fuius = fi-lius.

The omission of ι=*ya* in ἔφῡν is shown by the quantity of υ in the plural; comp. ἔφῡμεν with ἐδείκνῠμεν. It will be seen at once that the Latin verb is much more complete than the Greek: and besides these forms, which admit of direct comparison, the Latin neuter verb has a present subjunctive *fuam = fu-iam*, a pluperfect indicative *fu-eram = fuesam*, a perfect subjunctive *fuerim* (or *fuero*) = *fuve-sim*, and a corresponding pluperfect *fuissem = fuve-se-sim*. The *s* = *r*, which appears in the last three of these forms, is best explained by a comparative analysis of πέφυκα and *fui = fufui*. As *i* is the regular exponent of guttural vocalization, as the guttural, before it subsides into *i*, is generally softened into *s* and *h*, and as we find *k*, *s*, *h* in the perfect and aorist of Greek verbs, we see that πέφυκα compared with *fufui* presumes an intermediate *fufusa*, and thus, by a transposition and substitution quite analogous to the French change of *l* through *ul* into *u*, we get the following explanation of the existing forms of the Latin perfect, in accordance with the assumption of an original inflexion in *-sa*.

πέφυ-κα-[μι]	*fufu-sa-m = fufuis = fufui*
πέφυ-κα-ς (or -θα: cf. οἶσ-θα)	*fufu-sa-tha = fufui-s-ti*
πέφυ-κε-ν (for -τι)	*fufa-sa-t = fufui-s-t = fufuit*
πεφύ-κα-με-ν (for -με-ς)	*fufu-sa-mus = fufui-s-mus = fufuimus*
πεφύ-κά-τε (for -τες)	*fufu-sa-tis = fufui-s-tis*
πεφύ-κα-σι (for -ντι)	*fufu-s-ant = fufue-snt = fufuerunt.*

The *i*, which appears before the *r* = *s* in the mutilated inflexions of the Latin perfect, assumes the weaker form of *e* in the pluperfect, which must originally have corresponded in termination to the perfect, though the loss of the distinguishing augment has obliged the Latin language to have recourse to a variation of the affixes in the secondary tenses. Thus, while we must have had originally *e-fufusa* by the side of *fufusa*, the former has become *fueram*, while the latter has shrunk into *fui*. We must take care not to confuse between the *i*, which represents a lost *s* in

fui, and that which appears as the characteristic of the subjunctive mood in *fu-am* = *fu-iam* and in *fuerim* = *fue-sim*; for although there is every reason to believe that the *s* = *r* of the fut. and perf. is really identical ultimately with the *i* of the subjunctive, the actual functions are different in the cases which require to be discriminated. Originally, no doubt, *fac-sim* and *forem* = *fu-sim* were futures indicative which had corresponding aorists, but, like the Greek conjunctive, which was originally future, they have been remanded to a subordinate position. The loss of the original reduplication might lead us to confuse between *forem* = *fu-sim* and *fuerim* = *fufu-sim*; but the latter is really a subjunctive formation from the perfect indicative, entirely analogous to τετύφοιμι from τέτυφα. From *fuerim* we have *fuissem* = *fufu-sa-sim* by the same extension which converts *sim* = *esim* or *esyam* into *essem* = *es-sa-im* or *es-sa-yam*. This use of the affix *s* in successive accretions to form the secondary past tenses, although regular in its application to the Latin verb, is quite inconsistent with the use of the same affix in the Greek verb, where it seems to indicate proximate futurity.

The association of the roots *es-* and *fu-*, as supplementary tenses of one substantive verb, and the use of the latter to form more or less of the subordinate inflexions of all other verbs, is best explained by the meaning of these two roots themselves. For while *es-* denotes "continuance of being," *i. e.* "existence," *fu-* expresses "beginning of being," or "coming into being." The parallelism therefore between *es-* and *fu-* is the same as that between the Greek εἰμί = ἐσ-μί, and γί-γνομαι, which furnishes the materials for the opposition between the systems of Plato and Heracleitus. There is the same association of resemblance and contrast between the Hebrew roots יֵשׁ, which agrees with the Sanscrit *as* and our *es-se*, and הָוָה or הָיָה, which coincides in meaning, and ultimately in origin, with the Sanscr. *bhu*, the Greek γα = γεν, and our *fu*. And whatever may be the true view with regard to the explanation of the names *fô* and *buddhâ*, there cannot be the least doubt that the much more important name יְהוָה or יְהֹוָה has reference to the fact, that the God of Revelation is the God who manifests himself historically, so that while אלהים is the Beginning and the End, יהוה is the Middle, that is, God manifested in the world, and therefore always in process of being or becoming by his acts of

redemption and creative power[1]. It is obvious that, with this difference of meaning, *es-* is adapted to express the continuous tenses of a verb of being, while *fu-* describes the completion of single acts, coming into being and successively determined. Thus *es-* will give us the present and imperfect, together with the vague future or potential *sim* = *ero*. The perfect and its derivatives will naturally be furnished by *fui*, "I have become," or "I have come into being." The form *forem*, which is used as a synonym for *essem*, is probably an aorist, which, like the Greek optative, has lost its augment (*New Crat.* § 391). It is therefore, as it stands, externally identical with the original future, of which *fuam* = *fu-yam* is a mere mutilation. The future signification is retained by *fo-re*, "to become," which is really a present tense analogous to *es-se;* for *fieri* is a later and irregular form.

§ 5. *Paucity of Organic Formations in the regular Latin Verb.*

The conjugations of these two verbs furnish us with specimens of organic inflexions for all the tenses, in other words, the tenses are formed without the aid of any foreign adjunct except those pronominal elements which contribute to the living machinery of all inflected languages. But this is not the case with the great mass of verbs which constitute the staple of the Latin language. Although the flexion-forms in *s-* and *i-* appear in all these verbs, there is no one of them which is not indebted more or less to *fu-* for its active tenses; and all verbs form some tenses of their passive voice by calling in the aid of *es-*.

According to the ordinary classification of Latin verbs, there are three conjugations of vowel-verbs, in *a*, *e*, and *i*, and one conjugation of consonant-verbs, to which we must assign the verbs in *uo* and some of those in *io*. Now, as a general rule, we find that all vowel-verbs are secondary to nouns—in other words, they are derived from the crude forms of nouns. But many nouns are demonstrably secondary to consonant-verbs. Therefore we might infer, as a general rule, that the consonant-verb belonged to a class of forms older or more original than the vowel-verbs. This view is supported by a comparison of the

[1] This idea is well developed by Delitzsch, *Genesis*, pp. 23, 389, 390.

tenses of the two sets of verbs: for while we find that *s-* often effects a primary variation in the consonant-verb, we observe that this insertion never takes place in the vowel-verb except in composite forms, or in those verbs which neglect the vowel characteristic in the formation of their perfects. The only tense in the consonant-verb, which can be considered as a composite form, is the imperfect; but the future does not correspond to this, as is the case in the vowel-verbs. Verbs in *io* partially approximate to the consonant-verbs in this respect.

§ 6. *General scheme of Tenses in the Latin Verb.*

The following table will show the organic formations and agglutinate additions, by which the tenses of the Latin verb are constructed from the crude form. With regard to the perfect indicative, it is necessary to premise that, in addition to the parathetic or agglutinate combination with *-fui*, which will be mentioned presently, there are two forms in common use: one which may be considered as a regular perfect, exactly corresponding to *fui* = *fufui*, with a reduplication either expressed or implied, and with the *-s* or guttural of the affix represented, as in *fui*, by *i* or *is;* and another, which may be regarded as an aorist in *-si*, although the inflexions of the persons exhibit the same retention of *i* or *is* as the regular perfect, and therefore presume the addition of a repeated *s* or *sa* = *ra*, which appears in the pluperfect.

	VOWEL-VERBS.		CONSONANT-VERBS.	
	Organic forms.	Agglutinate forms.	Organic forms.	Agglutinate forms.
A. I.	*-o*		*-o*	
A. II.		*-bam* for *e-fiam*		*-bam* for
A. III.	*-ui* for *fui*		*-i* or *-si*	*e-fiam*
A. IV.	*-ueram* for *fueram*		*-eram* or *-seram*	
A. V.	*-bo* for *fio*		*-im*	
C. I.	*-im*		*-im*	
C. II.	*-rem=sem*		*-rem* = *-sem*	
C. III.		*-uerim* for *fuerim*	*-ero* or *-sero*	
C. IV.		*-uissem* for *fuissem*	*-issem* or *-sissem.*	

§ 7. *Verbs which may be regarded as Parathetic Compounds.*

The fourteenth chapter will show that the most remarkable feature in the pathology of the Latin language is the prevalent tendency to abbreviation by which it is characterised. Among many instances of this, we may especially advert to the practice of prefixing the crude form of one verb to some complete inflexion of another. Every one knows the meaning of such compounds as *vide-licet* (= *videre licet*,) *sci-licet* (= *scire licet*), *pate-facio* (= *patere facio*), *ven-eo* (= *venum eo*, comp. *venum-do*, on the analogy of *per-eo*, *per-do*)[1], &c. There is a distinct class of verbs in *-so*, which are undoubtedly compounds of the same kind, as will appear from an examination of a few instances. The verb *si-n-o* has for its perfect *sivi*; and it is obvious that the *n* in the present is only a fulcrum of the same nature as that in *tem-no*, root *tem-*; πί-νω, root πι-, &c. Now the verbs in *-so*, to which I refer, such as *arcesso*, *capesso*, *incipesso*, *lacesso*, *petesso*, *quæro*, &c., all form their perfect in *-sivi*. We might therefore suppose *a priori*, that the termination was nothing but the verb *sino*. But this is rendered almost certain by the meaning of *arcesso* or *accerso*, which is simply *accedere sino*[2], "I cause to approach," i. e. "I send for." Similarly, *capesso* = *capere sino*, "I let myself take," i. e. "I undertake," *facesso* = *facere sino*, "I let myself make," i. e. "I set about," *lacesso* = *lacere sino*, "I let myself touch," i. e. "I provoke or irritate," &c. The infinitive of *in-quam* (above, p. 112) does not exist; but there can be little doubt that it is involved in *quæ-ro* or *quæ-so*, which means "I cause to speak," i. e. "I inquire." That *quae-so* was an actual form of *quae-ro* may be seen from the passages of Ennius quoted by Festus (p. 258, Müller):

---

[1] The true orthography, *ven-dico* for *vindico*, furnishes a third illustration of *ven-do*, i. e.

ven-eo, "I go for sale" = I am sold.
ven-do, or *venum-do*, "I give for sale" = I sell.
ven-dico, "I declare for sale" = I claim.

[2] I am not aware that any other scholar has suggested this explanation. Müller (*ad Fest.* p. 320) thinks that *arcesso* is the inchoative of *arceo* = *accieo*: but, in the first place, the reading in Festus is by no means certain (Huschke's *arce dantur* being, I think, an almost necessary correction); and secondly, this would leave *accerso* unexplained.

Ostia munita est; idem loca navibu' pulchris
Munda facit, nautisque mari *quœsentibu'* vitam (*Annal.* II.).
Ducit me uxorem liberorum sibi *quœsendum* gratia (*Cresphont.*).
Liberum *quœsendum* causa familiæ matrem tuæ (*Andromed.*).

These parathetic compounds with *sino, so, sivi,* are analogous to the Hebrew conjugations in *Pi"hel* and *Hiph"hil.* Sometimes the causative sense refers to the object, as in *arcesso,* "I cause *him* to come," *quae-ro,* "I cause *him* to speak." Sometimes it is reflexive, as in the conjugation *Hithpa"hel;* thus, we have *facesso,* "I let *myself* do it—I set about it," &c. *Pi"hel* and *Hiph"hil* only differ as ἐτύπην differs from ἐτύφθην, according to the explanation which I have given of these tenses (*New Crat.* § 382). We shall see below (§ 15), that the same explanation applies to the infinitives in *-assere.*

§ 8. *Tenses of the Vowel-verbs which are combinations of the same kind.*

Most of the tenses of the Latin vowel-verb seem to be composite forms of the same kind with those to which I have just referred; and the complete verbal inflexion, to which the crude form of the particular verb is prefixed, is no other than a tense of the verb of existence *fu-,* Lithuan. *bu-,* Sanscrit *bhû-* (see Bopp, *Vergl. Gram. vierte Abtheil.* pp. iv. and 804). This verb, as we have seen, expresses "beginning of being," or "coming into being," like the Greek γίγνομαι. It is therefore well calculated to perform the functions of an auxiliary in the relation of time. For *ama-bam* = *ama-e-fiam* = "I became to love," "I was loving;" *ama-bo* = *ama-fio* = "I am coming into love," = "I am about to love;" *ama-vi* = *ama-fui* = "I have come into love," = "I have loved," &c.

The vowel-verb has a present tense which preserves throughout the vowel of the crude form. From this is derived, with the addition of the element *i,* the present subjunctive, as it is called; and from that, by the insertion of *s-,* the imperfect of the same mood. Thus we have *amêm=ama-im, amarem=amasem =ama-sa-im; moneâm=mone-yam, monerem=monesem=mone-syam,* &c. That *i* was the characteristic of the secondary or dependent mood is clear from the old forms *du-im* (*dêm*), *temper-im, ed-im, verber-im, car-im,* &c., which, however, are abbreviations from *du-yam, ed-yam,* &c. Comp. *sim* with the older

form *siem*, and δίδοιμι, &c. with διδοίην, &c. The *i* is absorbed or included in *moneam=mone-yam*, *legam=leg-yam*, &c.; just as we have *nav-ālis* for *navi-alis*, *fin-ālis* for *fini-alis*, &c. (Benary, *Römische Lautlehre*, p. 95.) These are the only tenses which are formed by pronominal or organic additions to the root of the verb. Every other tense of the vowel-verb is a compound of the crude form of the verb and some tense of *fu-* or *bhu-*.

The futures of the vowel-verbs end in *-bo*, *-bis*, *-bit*, &c., with which we may compare *fio*, *fis*, *fit*, &c. The imperfect, which must be considered as an indefinite tense corresponding to the future, ends in *-ēbam*, *-ēbas*, *-ēbat*, &c., where the initial must be regarded as an augment; for as *reg'-ēbat* is the imperfect of the consonant-verb *reg'o*, not *regĕbat*, and as *audi-ēbat* is the imperfect of *aud-io*[1], though *audi-bit* was the old future, it is clear that the suffix of the imperfect had something which did not belong to the crude form, but to the termination itself; it must therefore have been an augment, or the prefix which marks past time (see Benary, *l. c.* p. 29).

The perfect of the vowel-verbs is terminated by *-vi* or *-ui*. If we had any doubt as to the origin of this suffix, it would be removed by the analogy of *pot-ui* for *pot-fui=potis-fui*. Accordingly, *ama-vi* (=*ama-ui*), *mon-ui*, *audi-vi* (=*audi-ui*), are simply *ama-fui=amare-fui*, *mon-fui=monere-fui*, and *audi-fui=audire-fui*.

Similarly, with regard to the tenses derived from the perfect, we find that the terminations repeat all the derivatives of *fui*: thus, *ama-uero=ama-fuero*; *ama-uisses=ama-fuisses*, &c.

It will be observed that the *f* of *fio* and *fui* never appears in these agglutinate combinations. The explanation of this involves some facts of considerable importance.

We have seen above (p. 242) that the Latin *f* involves a guttural as well as a labial, and that the *v*, which formed a part of the sound, had a tendency to pass into *b* (p. 240). If, then, which seems to be the case, the long vowel, which always forms the link of communication in this parathesis, absorbed and included the guttural part of the *f* (*New Crat.* § 116), the re-

[1] Virgil has *lenibat* (Æn. VI. 468) and *polibant* (VIII. 436); but these must be considered as poetical abbreviations.

maining labial would necessarily appear as *b*, except in the perfect, where it would subside into the *u*, just as *fuvit* itself became *fuit*. In general we observe that, with the exception of the three or four words ending in the verbal stem *fer* (*furci-fer*, *luci-fer*, &c.), the letter *f* does not appear among Latin terminations; and as the terminations *-ber*, *-bra*, *-brum*, *-bulum* are manifestly equivalent in meaning to *-cer*, *-crum*, *-culum*, it is reasonable to conclude that these formations begin with letters which represent the divergent articulations of the compound *f* or **F** (see *New Crat.* § 267).

§ 9. *Organic Derivation of the Tenses in the Consonant-verb.*

The consonant verb, on the other hand, forms all its tenses, except the imperfect[1], by a regular deduction from its own root. Thus we have *reg'o* [old fut. *reg-so*], 1 aor. [*e*]-*reg-si*; subjunct. pres. or precative, *regam=regyam*, *regas=regyas*, or, in a softer form, *regês=rege-is*, &c.; subj. imperf. or optat. *regerem=rege-syam*; subj. perf. *reg-se-ro=reg-se-sim*; subj. plup. *regsissem=reg-si-se-syam*. If we might draw an inference from the forms *facsit*, &c., which we find in old Latin, and from *fefakust*, &c., which appear in Oscan, we should conclude that the Italian consonant-verb originally possessed a complete establishment of definite and indefinite tenses, formed from the root by pronominal or organic addition, or by prefixing augments and reduplications after the manner of the genuine Greek and Sanscrit verbs. For example's sake, we may suppose the following scheme of tenses: root *pag*, pres. *pa-n-go-m*, impf. [*e*]-*pangam*, fut. *pan-g-sim*, 1 aor. *e-pangsim*, perf. *pe-pigi-m*, pluperf. *pe-pige-sam*, subj. pres. *pangyam*, subj. imp. *pangesyam*, subjunct. perf. *pepige-sim* or *pangse-sim*, subj. pluperf. (derived from this) *pepigise-syam* or *pang-si-se-syam*.

§ 10. *Auxiliary Tenses of the Passive Voice.*

In the passive voice, those tenses, which in the active depend upon *fui* and its derivatives, are expressed by the passive participle and the tenses of *e-sum*. The other tenses construct the

[1] The loss of the imperfect, and the substitution of a compound tense, is accounted for by the practice of omitting the augment. Without this prefix the regular imperfect does not differ from the present.

passive by the addition of the letter *r=s* to the person-endings of the active forms, with the exceptions mentioned before. The second person plural of the passive is of such rare occurrence, that we cannot draw any decided conclusions respecting it; but if such a form as *audi-ébamini* occurred, it would certainly occasion some difficulty; for one could scarcely understand how the *é*, which seems to be the augment of the auxiliary suffix, could appear in this apparently participial form. Without stopping to inquire whether we have any instances of the kind, or whether *ama-bamini* might not be a participle as well as *ama-bundus* (compare *ama-bilis*, &c.), it is sufficient to remark that when the origin of a form is forgotten, a false analogy is often adopted and maintained. This secondary process is fully exemplified by the Greek *ἐτίθε-σαν*, *τυπτέτω-σαν*, &c. (*New Crat.* § 363).

Nor need we find any stumblingblock in the appendage of passive endings to this neuter auxiliary verb. For the construction of neuter verbs with a passive affix is common enough in Latin (e. g. *peccatur*, *ventum est*, &c.); and the passive infinitive *fieri*, and the usual periphrasis of *iri* with the supine, for the future infinitive of a passive verb, furnish us with indubitable instances of a similar inflexion. We might suppose that the Latin future was occasionally formed periphrastically with *eo* as an auxiliary like the Greek *ἦα λέγων*, Fr. *j'allois dire*, "I was going to say." If so, *amatum eo*, *amatum ire*, would be the active futures of the indicative and infinitive, to which the passive forms *amatum eor*, *amatum iri*, would correspond. The latter of these actually occurs, and, indeed, is the only known form of the passive infinitive future.

§ 11. *The Modal Distinctions—their Syntax.*

Properly speaking, there are only three main distinctions of mood in the forms of the Latin and Greek verb, namely, the indicative, the imperative, and the infinitive. The Greek grammars practically assign five distinct moods to the regular verb, namely, the indicative, imperative, conjunctive, optative, and infinitive. But it has been already proved (*New Crat.* § 388), that, considered in their relation to one another and to the other moods, the Greek conjunctive and optative must be regarded as differing in tense only. The Latin grammarians are contented

with four moods, namely, the indicative, subjunctive, imperative, and infinitive; and according to this arrangement, the present subjunctive Latin answers to the Greek conjunctive, while the imperfect subjunctive Latin finds its equivalent in the optative of the Greek verb: for instance, *scribo, ut discas* corresponds to *γράφω, ἵνα μανθάνῃς*, and *scripsi, ut disceres* to *ἔγραψα, ἵνα μανθάνοις*. If, however, we extend the syntactical comparison a little farther, we shall perhaps be induced to conclude that there is not always the same modal distinction between the Latin indicative and subjunctive which we find in the opposition of the Greek indicative to the conjunctive + optative. Thus, to take one or two instances, among many which might be adduced, one of the first lessons which the Greek student has to learn is, to distinguish accurately between the four cases of protasis and apodosis, and, among these, more especially between the third, in which two optatives are used, and the fourth, in which two *past* tenses of the indicative are employed[1]. Now the Latin syntax makes no such distinction between the third and fourth cases, only taking care in the fourth case to use past tenses, and in the third case, where the hypothesis is possible, to employ present tenses of the subjunctive mood. Thus, *e.g.*, in the third

---

[1] This is, indeed, a very simple and obvious matter: but it may be convenient to some readers, if I subjoin a tabular comparison of the Greek and Latin usages in this respect. The classification is borrowed from Buttmann's *Mittlere Grammatik*, § 139 (p. 394, Lachmann's edition, 1833).

1. Possibility without the expression of uncertainty:
   εἴ τι ἔχει, δίδωσι (*δός*) = *si quid habet, dat* (*da*).
2. Uncertainty with the prospect of decision:
   ἐάν τι ἔχωμεν, δώσομεν = *si quid habeamus, dabimus.*
3. Uncertainty without any such subordinate idea:
   εἴ τι ἔχοις, διδοίης ἄν = *si quid habeas, des.*
4. Impossibility, or when we wish to indicate that the thing is not so:
   (*a*) *εἴ τι εἶχεν, ἐδίδου ἄν* = *si quid haberet, daret.*
   (*b*) *εἴ τι ἔσχεν, ἔδωκεν ἄν* = *si quid habuisset, dedisset.*

The distinction between cases (3) and (4) is also observed in the expression of a wish: thus, *utinam salvus sis!* pronounces no opinion respecting the health of the party addressed; but *utinam salvus esses!* implies that he is no longer in good health.

case: *si hoc nunc vociferari velim, me dies, vox, latera deficiant;* where we should have in Greek: εἰ τοῦτο ἐν τῷ παραυτίκα γεγωνεῖν ἐθέλοιμι, ἡμέρας ἄν μοι καὶ φωνῆς καὶ σθένους ἐνδεήσειεν. In the fourth case: (*a*) *si scirem, dicerem* = εἰ ἠπιστάμην, ἔλεγον ἄν. (*b*) *si voluissem plura, non negasses* = εἰ πλεόνων ἐπεθύμησα, οὐκ ἂν ἠρνήσω. And this confusion becomes greater still, when, by a rhetorical figure, the *impossible* is supposed *possible;* as in Ter. *Andr.* II. 1, 10: *tu si hic sis, aliter sentias.* For in this instance the only difference between the two cases, which is one of tense, is overlooked. In the apodosis of case 4, b, the Romans sometimes used the plusquam-perfectum of the indicative, as in Seneca, *de Ira*, I. 11: *perierat imperium, si Fabius tantum ausus esset, quantum ira suadebat;* and Horace, II. *Carm.* 17, 27: *me truncus illapsus cerebro sustulerat, nisi Faunus ictum dextra levasset.* Sometimes the perfect was used in this apodosis, as in Juvenal, X. 123: *Antoni gladios potuit contemnere, si sic omnia dixisset;* or even the imperfect, as in Tacitus, *Annal.* XII. 39: *nec ideo fugam sistebat, ni legiones pugnam excepissent.* Again, particles of time, like *donec*, require the subjunctive when future time is spoken of; as in Hor. I. *Epist.* 20, 10: *carus eris Romæ, donec te deserat ætas.* But this becomes a past tense of the indicative when past time is referred to; as in Hor. I. *Epist.* 10, 36: *cervus equum—pellebat—donec* [*equus*] *imploravit opes hominis frænumque recepit.* The confusion between the Latin indicative and subjunctive is also shown by the use of the subjunctive present as a future indicative (a phenomenon equally remarkable in Greek, *New Crat.* § 393), and conversely by the employment of the periphrastic future (which is, after all, the same kind of form as the ordinary composite form of the future indicative) as an equivalent for a tense of the subjunctive mood. Thus Cicero uses *dicam* and *dicere instituo* in the same construction; *Phil.* I. 1: "*antequam* de republica *dicam* ea, quæ dicenda hoc tempore arbitror, exponam breviter consilium profectionis meæ." *Pro Murena*, 1: "*antequam* pro L. Murena *dicere instituo*, pro me ipso pauca dicam." And we have always the indicative in apodosis to the subjunctive when the future in *-rus* is used: *e. g.* Liv. XXXVIII. 47: "si tribuni prohiberent, testes *citaturus fui*" (for "*citarem*"); and Cic. *Verr.* III. 52: "illi ipsi aratores, qui remanserant, *relicturi* omnes agros *erant*"

(for "*reliquissent*"), "nisi ad eos Metellus Roma literas misisset." The Romans also used the perfect subjunctive exactly as the Greeks used their perfect indicative with καὶ δή in suppositions.

On the whole, it must be confessed that the Latin subjunctive, meaning by that term the set of tenses which are formed by the insertion of *-i-*, differs modally from the indicative only in this, that it is uniformly employed in dependent clauses where the idiom of the language repudiates the indicative; and it is not a little remarkable, that in almost all these cases—in all, except when final particles are used, or when an indirect question follows a past tense—the indicative is expressly required in Greek syntax. The title *subjunctive*, therefore, does but partially characterise the Latin tenses in *-i-;* and their right to a separate modal classification is scarcely less doubtful than that of the Greek optative as distinguished from the conjunctive.

The differences between the indicative, imperative, and infinitive equally exist between the two latter and the subjunctive. The indicative and subjunctive alone possess a complete apparatus of person-endings; the imperative being sometimes merely the crude form of the verb, and the infinitive being strictly impersonal.

§ 12. *Forms of the Infinitive and Participle—how connected in derivation and meaning.*

He who would investigate accurately the forms of the Latin language must always regard the infinitive as standing in intimate connexion with the participles. There are, in fact, three distinct forms of the Latin infinitive: (*a*) the residuum of an *abstractum verbale* in *-sis*, which remains uninflected; (*b*) a similar verbal in *-tus*, of which two cases are employed; (*c*) the participial word in *-ndus*, which is used both as three cases of the infinitive governing the object of the verb, and also as an adjective in concord with the object. There are also three forms of the participle: (*α*) one in *-ns* = *-nts*, sometimes lengthened into *-ndus;* (*β*) another in *-tus;* and a third (*γ*) in *-tūrus*. The participle in *-ns* is always active; its by-form in *-ndus* is properly active, though it often seems to be passive. The participle in *-tus* is always passive, except when derived from a deponent verb,

in which case it corresponds in meaning to the Greek aorist middle. The participle in *-tūrus* is always active and future. It is, in fact, an extension of the noun of agency in *-tor;* compare *prætor, prætura; scriptor, scriptura,* &c. with the corresponding future in *-turus* of *præo, scribo,* &c. (see *New Crat.* § 267). The Greek future participle is sometimes used as a mere expression of agency; thus we have in Soph. *Antig.* 261: *οὐδ' ὁ κωλύσων παρῆν.* Aristot. *Eth. Nic.* II. 1, § 7: *οὐδὲν ἂν ἔδει τοῦ διδάξοντος*—where we should use the mere nouns of agency—"the make-peace"—"the teacher."

Now it is impossible to take an instructive view of these forms without considering them together. The participle in *-turus* (*γ*) is a derivative from the verbal in *-tus* (*b*); and it would be difficult to avoid identifying the participle in *-ndus* and the corresponding gerundial infinitive. In the following remarks, therefore, I shall presume, what has been proved elsewhere (*New Crat.* § 416), the original identity of the infinitive and the participle.

That the verbal (*a*), which acts as the ordinary infinitive in *re=se,* is derived from the crude form of the verb by the addition of a pronominal ending *si-* or *sy-*, is clear, no less from the analogy of the Æolic Greek forms in *-ις*, where the *ι* is transposed (comp. *N. Crat.* § 410, (3)), than from the original form of the passive, which is *-rier=-syer,* and not merely *-rer.* This infinitive, therefore, is the indeclinable state of a derivative precisely similar to the Greek nouns in *-σις* (*πρᾶξις, ῥῆ-σις,* &c.), which express the action of the verb. This Greek ending in *-σις* appears to have been the same in effect as another ending in *-τύς*, which, however, is of less frequent occurrence (*ἐπη-τύς, ἐδη-τύς, ὀρχησ-τύς,* &c.), but which may be compared with the Latin infinitive (*b*) in *-tum, -tu,* (the *supine,* as it is called), and with the Sanscrit gerund in *-tvâ.* The verbal in *-tus,* which is assumed as the origin of these supines, must be carefully distinguished from the passive participle (*β*) in *-tus.* For it appears, from forms like *venum,* &c., and the Oscan infinitives *moltaum,* &c., that the *t* of the supine is not organic, but that the infinitive (*b*) is formed like the infinitive (*a*) by a suffix belonging to the *second* pronominal element, so that the labial (u = v) is an essential part of the ending. On the other hand, the participle (*β*) has merely a dental suffix derived from the *third* pronomi-

nal element, and corresponding to the Greek endings in *-τος, -νος*, and the Latin *-tus=-nus*. In fact, the suffix of infinitive (*b*) is *tv=Fa* or *va*, while that of participle (*β*) is *t-* only.

§ 13. *The* Gerundium *and* Gerundivum *shown to be active and present.*

The infinitive (*c*) and the participle (*a*) are, in fact, different, or apparently different, applications of one and the same form. In its infinitive use this verbal in *-ndus* is called by two names—the *gerundium* when it governs the object of the verb, and the *gerundivum* when it agrees with the object. Thus, in "consilium *capiendi* urbem," we have a *gerundium;* in "consilium urbis *capiendæ*," a *gerundivum*. As participles, the ordinary grammatical nomenclature most incorrectly distinguishes the form in *-ndus* as "a future passive," from the form *-n[t]s* considered as "a present active." The form in *-ndus* is never a future, and it bears no resemblance to the passive in *form*. The real difficulty is to explain to the student the seeming alternation of an active and passive *meaning* in these forms. Perhaps there is no better way of doing this than by directing attention to the fact, that the difference between active and passive really becomes evanescent in the infinitive use of a verb. "He is a man to love"="he is a man to be loved;" "I give you this to eat" ="I give you this to be eaten," &c.[1] The Greek active infinitives in *-μεναι, -ναι*, are really passive forms in their inflected use[2]; and that the Latin forms in *-ndus*, which seem to be

---

[1] We observe the same fact in the use of the participles in English and German. Thus, in Herefordshire, "a good-leapt horse" means "a good-leaping horse;" and in German there is no perceptible difference between *kam geritten* and *kam reitend*. See Mr. Lewis's *Glossary of Provincial Words used in Herefordshire*, p. 58; and Grimm, *D. Gr.* IV. p. 129.

[2] Conversely, the forms in *-ντ-*, which are always active when used in concord with a noun, are occasionally employed in that infinitive sense in which the differences of voice seem to be neglected. Thus we have, Soph. *Aj.* 579: *θρηνεῖν ἐπῳδὰς πρὸς τομῶντι πήματι* ("*ad vulnus quod secturam desideret*" s. "*secandum sit*"). *Œd. Col.* 1219: *ὅταν τις ἐς πλέον πέσῃ τοῦ θέλοντος* ("*quando quis cupiendi satietatem expleverit*" s. "*id quod cupiebat plene consecutus fuerit*"). Thucyd. I. 36: *γνώτω τὸ μὲν δεδιὸς αὑτοῦ—τοὺς ἐναντίους μᾶλλον φοβῆσον* ("*sciat timere illud suum—majorem adversariis metum incussurum esse*").

passive in their use as *gerundiva,* are really only secondary forms of the participle in *-n[t]s,* appears not only from etymological considerations (*New Crat.* § 415), but also from their use both as active infinitives and active participles. When the *gerundivum* is apparently passive, it seems to attach to itself the sense of *duty* or *obligation.* Thus, we should translate *delenda est Carthago,* "Carthage is *to be destroyed*"="we ought to destroy Carthage;" and no one has taken the trouble to inquire whether this *oportet* is really contained in the *gerundivum.* If it is, all attempts at explanation must be unavailing. But since it is not necessary to seek in the participial form this notion, which may be conveyed by the substantive verb (e. g. *sapientis est seipsum nosse*), it is surely better to connect the *gerundivum* with the *gerundium,* and to reconcile the use of the one with the ordinary force of the other. Supposing, therefore, that *da-ndus* is a secondary form of *da-n[t]s,* and synonymous with it, on the analogy of *Acraga[nt]s, Agrige-ntum; orie-n[t]s, oriu-ndus;* &c.; how do we get the phrase *da-nda est occasio,* "an opportunity is to be given," from *d-a-ndus=dan[t]s,* "giving?" Simply from the gerundial or infinitive use of the participle. Thus, (A) *da-ndus=da-n[t]s* signifies "giving;" (B) this, used as an infinitive, still retains its active signification, for *ad dandum opes* means "for giving riches"="to give riches;" (C) when this is attracted into the case of the object, the sense is not altered, for *ad opes dandas* is precisely equivalent to *ad dandum opes;* (D) when, however, this attraction appears in the nominative case, the error at once takes root, and no one is willing to see that it is still merely an attraction from the infinitive or indeclinable use of the participle. Even here, however, the intransitive verb enables us to bring back the student to a consideration of the real principle. For one can hardly fail to see that *vivendum est=vivere est* i. q. *oportet vivere;* and that there may be no doubt as to the identity of the uninflected with the inflected gerund in this case, Horace has put them together in the same sentence: "nunc est *bibendum,* nunc pede libero *pulsanda* tellus," where it is obvious that *tellus pulsanda est* is no less equivalent to "oportet pulsare tellurem," than "bibendum est" is to "oportet bibere." At all events, his Greek original expressed both notions by the infinitive with χρή:

νῦν χρὴ μεθύσθην καί τινα πρὸς βίαν
πίνην, ἐπειδὴ κάτθανε Μύρσιλος.

(Alcæus, *Fr.* 20. p. 575, Bergk.)

The strongest proof, that the involved meaning of the *gerundivum* is strictly that of the active verb, is furnished by the well-known fact that the attracted form is regularly preferred to the gerund in *-di, -do, -dum* governing the case, when the verb of the gerund requires an accusative case; thus we have: *ad tolerandos* rather than *ad tolerandum, labores; consuetudo hominum immolandorum* rather than *homines immolandi; triumviri reipublicæ constituendæ* rather than *constituendo rempublicam.* Indeed this is rarely departed from, except when two gerunds of a different construction occur in the same sentence, as in Sall. *Cat.* 4: "neque vero *agrum colendo* aut *venando*, servilibus officiis, intentum ætatem agere,"—because *venando* has nothing to do with *agrum.* The student might be led to suppose at first sight that the phrase: *lex de pecuniis repetundis*, "a law about extortion," literally denoted "a law concerning money to be refunded," and that therefore the *gerundivum* was passive in signification. But this *gerundivum* is used only in the genitive and ablative plural, to agree with *pecuniarum* and *pecuniis*, and we happen to have a passage of Tacitus (*Annal.* XIII. 33) which proves that the verbal is transitive: for the words: *a quo Lycii repetebant* are immediately followed by: *lege repetundarum damnatus est;* and thus we see that *lex de pecuniis repetundis* does not mean "a law concerning money to be refunded," but, "a law which provides for the redemanding of money illegally exacted."

This view of the case appears to me to remove most of the difficulties and confusions by which the subject of the gerund has hitherto been encumbered. There are three supplementary considerations which deserve to be adduced. The first is, that in the particular case where the *gerundivum* appears to be most emphatically passive—namely, when it implies that a thing is given out or commissioned *to be done*—it is found by the side of the active infinitive: thus, while we have such phrases as: "Antigonus Eumenem mortuum propinquis *sepeliendum* tradidit" (Corn. Nep. *Eum.* 13), we have by their side such as: "tristitiam et metus tradam protervis in mare Creticum *portare* ventis" (Hor. I. *Carm.* 26, 1). That the gerund in this case is really present, as well as active, appears from its opposition to the use

of the past participle; thus: *hoc faciundum curabo* means "I will provide for the doing of this:" *hoc factum volo* means "I wish it were already done." The second point to be noticed is that deponent verbs, which have no passive voice, employ the *gerundivum* in the attributive use, which, we are told, cannot easily be wrested to an active signification; as: *prœlia conjugibus loquenda*, "battles for wives to speak of." The third case is this; that the supines, which are only different cases of one and the same verbal, appear as active infinitives when the accusative is used (*-tum*), and as passive when the ablative is employed (*-tu*). Now, this seemingly passive use of the supine in *-tu* arises from the fact, that it appears only by the side of adjectives, in which case the active and passive forms of the infinitive are often used indifferently, and some adjectives take the supine in *-tu* when they expressly require an active infinitive, as in: "difficile est *dictu* (=*dicere*), quanto opere conciliet homines comitas affabilitasque sermonis" (Cic. *Off.* II. 14). Now this supine, which is thus identical with the infinitive active, frequently alternates with the gerund; compare, for instance: *quid est tam jucundum auditu* (Cic. *de Or.* I. 8), with: *verba ad audiendum jucunda* (id. ibid. I. 49). The active sense of the verbal in *-tus*=*-sus* is equally apparent in the dative case: thus we find such phrases as (Sallust, *Jugurth.* 24): "quoniam eo natus sum ut Jugurthæ scelerum *ostentui* essem," i. e. "since I have been born to serve as an exhibition of (=to exhibit) the wickedness of Jugurtha."

But the form in *-ndus* is not only *active* in voice, but also, as has been mentioned, *present* in tense. Thus, if we take a deponent verb, we often find a form in *-ndus* acting as a collateral to the common form in *-n*[*t*]*s*, and opposed with it to the form in *-tus*. For instance, *secundus* and *sequen*[*t*]*s* both signify "following," but *secutus*="having followed." The same is the distinction between *morien*[*t*]*s*, *moriundus*; *orien*[*t*]*s*, *oriundus*; *irascen*[*t*]*s*, *ira*[*s*]*cundus*; &c., on the one hand, and *mortuus*, *ortus*, *iratus*, &c., on the other. This cannot be remarked in active verbs, because the Latin language has no active past participle. If, however, we turn to the gerundial use of the form in *-ndus*, we may observe a distinction of tense between it and the participle in *-tus* even in the case of active verbs. Thus *volvendus* is really a present tense in Virgil, *Æneid.* IX. 7: *volvenda dies, en, attulit ultro*; comp. Ennius (apud Varro. *L. L.*

VII. § 104, p. 160, Müller), and Lucretius, V. 1275; because, in its inflected form, it is equivalent in meaning to *volvendo;* and the following passages show that the gerund is equivalent to the present participle: Virgil, *Georg.* II. 225: "multa virum *volvens durando* sæcula vincit;" Lucret. I. 203: "multaque *vivendo* vitalia vincere sæcla;" and id. III. 961: "omnia si pergas *vivendo* vincere sæcla." And the words of Livy (*præf. ad Hist.*): "quæ ante *conditam condendam*ve urbem traduntur," can only mean "traditions derived from a period when the city was neither *built* nor *building*."

§ 14. *The Participle in -tûrus.*

The participle (γ) in *-rus* or *-ūrus,* which always bears a future signification, is supported by an analogy in the Latin language which has no parallel either in Greek or Sanscrit. The Greek desiderative is formed from the ordinary future by the insertion of the element *i-*: thus δρά-ω, fut. δρά-σω, desiderative δρα-σείω. This desiderative is the common future in Sanscrit; though the Vêdas have a future, like the Greek, formed by the element *s-* only, without the addition of *i-*[1]. Now the regular future of *scribo* would be *scrip-so,* indicated by the aorist *scripsi;* but the desiderative is *scripturio.* We may infer, then, that in the loss of the regular future of the Latin verb, the desiderative and future participle have been formed by the addition of the future *r* = *s* and the desiderative *ri* = *si,* not to the crude form of the verb, but to the verbal in *-tus,* so that the desiderative is deduced immediately from the future participle in *-tur-us* or from the noun of agency in *-tor* (above, p. 360).

§ 15. *The Perfect Subjunctive.*

We have seen above (§ 4) that the form *fuerim* = *fuesim* is really a subjunctive tense of the usual kind derived from the perfect indicative *fui* = *fuesa.* As, however, the first person is occasionally written *fuero,* just as *sim* = *esim* or *erim* is shortened into *ero,* it has been common among grammarians to imagine two tenses as distinct as *ero* and *sim.* But this view is represented under two different forms: for while the older gram-

[1] See Rosen, on the *Rig-Véda Sanhita,* p. iv.

mars make *fuerim* and *fuero* two tenses of the subjunctive mood, the former being perfect, and the latter future, the more modern writers on the subject increase the confusion by referring the latter, as a *futurum exactum*, to the indicative mood, while the former retains its place as perfect subjunctive. Those, who have had any thing to do with the business of teaching the Latin language, need not be told that a young and thoughtful student will not derive much edification from the doctrine that *fuerit* is both *indicative* and *subjunctive*, both *past* and *future*. And those who are conversant with the higher kind of philology, know that, while *fuero* and *fuerim* are merely euphonic distinctions, all the other persons, having only one set of meanings, are necessarily inflexions of the same form. With regard to the signification of this perfect subjunctive, it is clear that, as it is formed from the perfect indicative just as the present subjunctive is formed from the present indicative, it must exhibit the same modification of meaning. Now *dicam* = *dic-yam* means "there is a probability of my speaking;" consequently *dixero* = *dic-se-rim* must mean, "there is a probability of my having spoken;" and in proportion as the former approximates to the predication, "I shall speak," in the same proportion does the latter express, "I shall have spoken." In strictness that which is called a *futurum exactum*, or *paulo-post-futurum*, can only exist in forms derived from the perfects of intransitive verbs. These forms exist in Greek both with the active and with the middle inflexions; thus from θνήσκω, "I am dying," τέθνηκα, "I am dead," we have τεθνήξομαι or τεθνήξω, "I shall have died," *i. e.* "I shall be found in the state of death;" from γράφω, "I am writing," we have γέγραφα, "I have written," γέγραμμαι, "I have been written," *i.e.* "I stand or remain written," γεγράψομαι, "I shall have been written," *i. e.* "I shall stand and remain written." Now it has been observed even by the old grammarians, that the Romans did not use these futures of the intransitive or passive perfect. Thus Priscian says (Let. VIII. c. 8. p. 388, Krehl): "quamvis Græci futurum quoque diviserunt in quibusdam verbis, in *futurum infinitum*, ut τύψομαι, et *paulo post futurum*, ut τετύψομαι,—melius tamen Romani considerata futuri ratione, quæ omnino incerta est, simplici in eo voce utuntur, *nec finiunt spatium futuri*." But if the Romans had no *futurum exactum* of the passive form, still less would they have one with active

inflexions. The question of moods, as we have seen above, is not one of forms, but one of syntactical usage. And if we wish to inquire whether there is any justification for those who place *fuero* in the indicative mood, we have only to ascertain whether there is really any difference in syntactical usage between this form and *fuerim*, and generally, whether the tense, which we call perfect subjunctive, is ever used as an indicative, that is, as a categorical predication, without any reference to a protasis, expressed or plainly implied. The confusion, into which some modern grammarians have fallen in regard to this tense, has arisen entirely from the use of the Latin subjunctive in the apodosis, without a qualifying particle of reference like the Greek ἄν. Hence the imperfect grammarian is extremely liable to confuse between a categorical and a consequential assertion, where the protasis is omitted; and while the Greek optative, with ἄν, is rendered by the future indicative, without any risk of a misunderstanding as to the logical intention of the phrase, the perfect subjunctive in Latin has been supposed to be merely a future indicative referring to completed action. The following comparison will show that there is no use of the tense now under consideration, which may not be referred to some parallel employment of the Greek conjunctive or optative aorist.

a. ἐάν τι ἔχῃς, δώσεις = si quid { habeas / habebis }, dabis.

b. ἐάν τι σχῇς, δώσεις = si quid habueris, dabis.

c. εἴ τι ἔχοις, διδοίης ἄν = si quid habeas, des.

d. εἴ τι σχοίης, δοίης ἄν = si quid habueris, dederis.

If in the second and fourth cases *habueris* and *dederis* are subjunctive or potential, the same explanation must apply to the following:

a. *si plane occidimus, ego omnibus meis exitio fuero,* "if we have altogether fallen, I shall have been (i. e. I shall prove in the result, γενοίμην ἄν) a destruction to all my friends."

b. *si pergis, abiero,* "if you go on, I shall have departed (i. e. I shall go at once, ἀπέλθοιμ' ἄν)."

c. *tu invita mulieres; ego accivero pueros,* "do you invite the ladies; after that, when you have done so, I shall be found to have sent for the boys (σὺ μὲν τὰς γυναῖκας κάλει· ἐγὼ δὲ τοὺς παῖδας ἂν μεταπεμψαίμην)."

That the difference between the subjunctive present (C. I.) and this subjunctive perfect (C. III.) is one of tense only, might be shown by numberless examples; thus we have (Plaut. *Trinum* II. 4, 137 = 538): *magis apage dicas, si omnia ex me audiveris,* and (III. 1, 21 = 621): *quoi tuam quom rem credideris, sine omni cura dormias,* where we have an apodosis corresponding to the Greek present optative with ἄν, preceded by a protasis containing an equivalent to the optative aorist. It is a mere assumption on the part of some grammarians that there is any difference of usage between the forms of the first person in *-ro* or *-rim.* The choice of one form or the other is a mere matter of euphony, and they are both equally subjunctive or potential in their nature. Thus we find in a hortative or deliberative sense: *huc aliquantum abscessero* (*Trinum.* III. 1, 25 = 625), "let me stand aside here a little;" and we find this form after *quum* in precisely the same manner as the imperfect and pluperfect subjunctive are used with that particle; thus: *quum extemplo arcum et pharetram mi et sagittas sumpsero* (*Trinum.* III. 2, 99 = 725); or after *ubi: extemplo ubi oppidum expugnavero* (*Bacch.* IV. 9, 52 = 977). So also Virg. *Georg.* I. 441, 2. We have sometimes both forms in the same passage; thus: *omnia ego istæc quæ tu dixti scio, vel exsignavero* (comp. the common use of *confirmaverim*): *ut rem patriam et gloriam majorum fœdarim meum* (*Trinum.* III. 2, 29 = 655). And no one will maintain that *credidero* and *crediderim* might not change places in the following passages; Plaut. *Trin.* III. 1, 6 = 606: *at tute ædepol nullus creduas. Si hoc non credis, ego credidero.* Virgil, *Georg.* II. 338: *non alios prima crescentis origine mundi illuxisse dies, aliumve habuisse tenorem crediderim.* And that the perfect subjunctive in *-rim* may come as near to a simply future signification as the corresponding form in *-ro,* is clear from Virgil, *Georg.* II. 101: *non ego te, Dis et mensis accepta secundis, transierim, Rhodia,* compared with Hor. IV. *Carm.* 9, 30: *non ego te meis chartis inornatum silebo.* There is the same indifference as to the employment of a form in *-o* or one in *-im* in the old aorists; thus we have *faxo* in Plaut. *Pœn.* I. 1, 34, but *faxim* in the same play, V. 2, 131. If these forms in *-ro* or *-rim* were ever modifications of the future indicative, this would be observable in the case of verbs like *memini, novi, odi,* which are used as present perfects. But we never find the

form in *-ro* or *-rim* used as a mere future to these virtually present verbs; on the contrary, while *meminerim* and *recorder* stand in the same subjunctive sentence (Cic. *pro Plancio*, c. 28 fin.), we have *recordabor* as the only future for the two verbs (id. *in Pison.* c. 6). And so of the others. It has been supposed that certain forms in *-assere*, which occur in Plautus, and seem to have the meaning of a future infinitive (e. g. *expugnassere, Amphitr.* I. 1, 55; *reconciliassere, Capt.* I. 2, 59; *impetrassere, Aulul.* IV. 7, 6), are infinitives corresponding to this tense in *-ro* or *-rim*, as though formed, e. g., from *expugnasso* = *expugnavero*[1]. Such a formation of an infinitive appears to me simply impossible; and as all these infinitives are referred to verbs of the *-a* conjugation, I have no difficulty in explaining these words in the same way as I have explained the agglutinate forms in *-esso, -essere* (above, § 7); and as *capes-so* = *capere-sino*, so *expugnas-so* = *expugnare-sino*. With regard to the apparently future signification of the infinitives in *-assere*, it is sufficient to remark that an auxiliary may give this meaning, as in the case of *dicere instituo* = *dicam*, mentioned above (§ 9); and the future in the Romance languages is always formed by an agglutinate appendage of *habeo*, as in *aur-ai* = *aver-ai* = *habere habeo*. As *fuero* = *fueso* and *fuerim* = *fuesim* oscillate between the forms *ero* = *eso* and *sim* = *esim*, so we find that the plural exhibits a similar freedom of choice; for *fuerĭmus* = *fu-erĭmus* or *fue-sīmus* represents either *erĭmus*, which is shortened in its penultima, or *sīmus*, which has lost its initial syllable. In the passive and deponent verbs the loss of the perfect subjunctive is supplied by a periphrastic tense made up of the future *ero* and the participle in *-tus*. It is a matter of indifference whether we refer this tense to a period when the future and present subjunctive of the substantive verb were still identical, or whether we suppose that it is an approximation to the Greek *paulo post futurum*, adopted to meet a syntactical exigency.

§ 16. *The Past Tense of the Infinitive Active.*

The past tense of the infinitive active ends in *-isse*, when it corresponds to the Greek first aorist, as *scripsisse;* when

---

[1] Madvig thinks that these forms result from a mistaken attempt to follow the Greek analogy of τύψειν from τύψω (*Bemerkungen über Lat. Sprl.* p. 41).

it is the regular perfect, as *tetigisse;* and when it is a composite form, as *ama-visse* = *ama-fuisse.* It is to be recollected that in all these cases the same tense inserts an *s* = *r* in the second person singular and second and third persons plural of the indicative mood. There can be little doubt that this doubling of the *s* in the infinitive (*-s-se*) is to be explained from the indicative mood. As we have *fui-s-tis* instead of *fufusa-tis,* so we have *fui-sse* instead of *fufusa-se;* and in both cases the additional *s* is analogous to that in *fuissem* = *fui-se-sim,* from *fuerim* = *fuesim.* This view is in accordance with all the similar phenomena. The other explanations, which have been given, are very unscientific and not even very plausible. It has been supposed that the additional *s* is designed to represent the lengthening of the penultimate syllable; but why should the termination *se* = *re* be appended by means of a long syllable to *fui* any more than to *es-* in *es-se* or to *dico* in *dicĕ-re?* Bopp is of course ready with his agglutination theory, and explains *ama-vi-sse* as a compound of *amavi* and *esse* (*Vergl. Gramm.* p. 1227). But, as he must see, this presumes a derivation of *fuisse* from *fui* and *esse,* and of *fueram* from *fui* and *eram,* so that *amaveram* = *ama-fui-eram* and *amavisse* = *ama-fui-esse.* It is only by remembering the great services, which Bopp has rendered to comparative philology, that we can reconcile such suggestions with any claim to a character for critical tact and acumen. The whole theory of inflected language would fall to pieces, if we could not explain even the future and aorist *s* without falling back upon the existing forms of the substantive verb. There must be some formative machinery in the verb besides the person-endings; and if we cannot explain the inflexions of *fui* without calling in the aid of *sum,* how are we to inflect *sum* itself through its own moods and tenses? It seems to me fallacious to suppose, as Bopp does (p. 1228), that the forms *scrip-se, consum-se, admis-se, divis-se, dic-se, produc-se, abstrac-se, advec-se,* are aorists corresponding to the Greek and related to the forms *scrip-so* or *scrip-sim* as γράπ-σαι is to ἔ-γραπ-σα. The Latin infinitive is always formed by adding *se* = *re* to the tense represented by the infinitive, which is merely denuded of its person-endings in order to qualify it for becoming the vehicle of this new appendage. From *scrip-so* we could only have *scrip-sere* = *scrip-sese,* as we have *scrib-ere* from *scribo.* As we

have *dixti* for *dic-si-s-ti*, *extinxem* for *exting-sis-sem*, *vixet* for *vic-sis-set*, &c., why should not *dixe* = *dic-se* for *dic-sis-se* be an analogous abbreviation? Not to speak of the tendency to shorten the forms of words, which generally characterizes the Latin language, the omission of the syllable *es* or *is* is invariable in the passive infinitive of all consonant-verbs; for as *amari* or *amarier* is formed from *amare* = *amase*, we ought to have *diceri* or *diceri-er* = *dic-es-ier* from *dicere* = *dicese*, but, in point of fact, we always find *dicier* or *dici*, which is related to *dic-es-ier* very much as *dic-se* is to *dic-sis-se*.

CHAPTER XII.

THE LATIN CONJUGATIONS.

§ 1. The conjugations are regulated by the same principle as the declensions. § 2. The first or *-a* conjugation. § 3. The second or *-e* conjugation. § 4. The third or *-i* conjugation. § 5. The fourth or consonant conjugation. A. Mute verbs. § 6. B. Liquid verbs. § 7. C. Semi-consonantal verbs. § 8. Irregular verbs. A. Additions to the present tense. § 9. B. Abbreviated forms. § 10. Defective verbs.

§ 1. *The Conjugations are regulated by the same principle as the Declensions.*

THERE is not much difficulty in seeing that the Latin conjugations ought to be arranged on the same principle as the declensions—namely, according to the characteristic letters of the different verbs. This mode of classification will give us three conjugations of verbs in *a, e, i,* which are regularly contracted; and one conjugation of consonant verbs, which retain their inflexions uncontracted, whether the characteristic is mute, liquid, or semi-consonant. In the first three conjugations, which contain none but derivative verbs, the crude form of a noun is made the vehicle of verbal inflexions by means of the formative affix *ya,* which belongs to the second pronominal element. We shall see that, while the *a* and *i* conjugations append this formative syllable to crude forms terminating in these vowels respectively, the *e* conjugation represents the pronominal affix by this vowel alone, because it generally consists of verbs formed from consonantal nouns. In the semi-consonantal forms, there is no difficulty in seeing that the *u* verbs belong to the fourth and not to the vowel conjugations; but in order to know when a verb in *-i* is to be considered as belonging to the vowel conjugation, and when, on the other hand, it is to be counted as a semi-consonantal verb, we must observe the evidences of contraction which are furnished in the former case by the second person singular of the present indicative, and by the present infinitive. Thus, while *audi-o* gives us *audîs* = *audi-is, audî-re* = *audi-ere,* and *audî-ri* = *audi-eri, cap-i-o* gives us *cap-ĭs, cap-ĕre,* and *capi.* Besides this, as we have already seen (above, Ch. XI. § 8), the vowel-verb is generally confined to an agglutinate perfect in *-vi.* There are indeed irregularities, which must be learned by expe-

rience, and which generally flow from the copartnership in different tenses of two distinct verbs, as when *peto, pĕtere* have a perfect and participle *petīvi* and *petītus*, from a lost verb in *-io*, or when *cupio, cupīvi, cupītus*, have an infinitive *cupĕre*, as though the *i* were a semi-consonantal adjunct. But the general distinctions of conjugations are those which discriminate the declensions of nouns.

§ 2. *The first or* -a *Conjugation.*

In laying down the general rules for the conjugation of a Latin verb, the grammarian has to consider, in the first instance, whether the perfect indicative (A. III.), or the passive participle (E. III.), present any deviation from the form of the verb; and he must then inquire what is the cause of this irregularity. Now, as we have seen in the previous chapter, the Latin verb has three forms of A. III.: (*α*) the proper or reduplicated perfect; (*β*) the aorist perfect in *-si;* (*γ*) the composite, or agglutinate, perfect in *-vi* or *-ui*, from *fui*. According to the general rule already given, the vowel-verb is properly limited to the third form of the perfect active. In point of fact, there are only two exceptions to this rule in the case of the *-a* verb, and these two exceptions give us the regular or reduplicated perfect. But the two verbs, in which this form is found, are both of them irregular. For *do*, which makes A. III. *dedi*, D. I. *dăre*, and E. III. *dătus*, does not fully and properly belong to the vowel-verbs, but partly also to the same class as its compounds *con-do, con-dis, con-didi, con-dĕre, con-dĭtus*. It is true that we have *dâs* for the second person singular of A. I., and that the common form of C. I. is *dem, des, det*, &c.; but *duim* is the old form of the latter; and the quantity of *a* in *dăbam, dărem*, shows that we have not to do with a verb of which the characteristic is *a*, but with one which preserves this form of its root or articulation vowel. The old *du-im*, compared with the Umbrian, Oscan, and Tuscan *tu-* (above, pp. 125, 129, 184), the German *thun*, &c., would lead us to the conclusion that *u* was the most ancient articulation-vowel of this root. In its primitive meaning, *do* reverts to the same sense as our "do," and the German *thun*. Like the Old Norse and Etruscan *lata*, and like *sino* in Latin, and *sri* in Etruscan, *do* is used not only with prepositions, but with other verbal roots, signifying "doing," or "causing," as

opposed to *eo*, which denotes the passive result of the action: thus we have *per-do*, or *pessum-do*, opposed to *per-eo*, *inter-do* to *inter-eo*, *ven-do* to *ven-eo*, &c. As we have a θ in the corresponding Greek forms *πέρ-θω*, &c., we may be led to conclude that the Latin *do* furnishes the link of connexion between *δίδωμι*, Sanscrit *dadâmi* and *τίθημι*, Sanscrit *dadhâmi*; which are therefore only different forms of the same root. The idea of "giving" is partly represented by that of "putting," or "placing," for acceptance. In regard to the offering of prizes, or the placing of meat on the table, the ideas of placing and giving run into one another, and it is well known that *pono* and *τίθημι* are regularly used in this sense (see my note on Pindar, *O.* XI. 63, and the commentators on Horace, I. *Serm.* 2, 106; II. 3, 23). But we may also represent the act of giving with reference to the donor as a liberal pouring forth of that which he has, and this is the primary sense of *gef-an*, *gib-an*, "give," *χέF-ω*, &c., as Grimm has shown in a recent paper on the subject (*Abh. Ak. Berl.* 1848: "über schenken und geben"). The other verb, which appears to belong to the *-a* conjugation, but has a reduplicated perfect, is *sto*, which makes A. III. *stĕti*. This verb does not give the same indications as *do* of a mere articulation-vowel; for even the compounds retain the long *ā*, which appears in *stābat*, &c. But we have a by-form, *si-sto*, to which *steti* may be referred, just as our transitive "stay," intransitive "stand," are represented by the German present *stehe*, perf. *stand*, both of which are intransitive. And I am inclined to explain the long *a* in *sto*, as resulting from a contraction of *staho* = *steyo*, Germ. *stehen*, which is still found in the Umbrian *stahito* = *stato* (above, p. 82). So that *sto* cannot be considered as a verb, of which the characteristic or formative adjunct is *-a*, but, like *do*, owes its contraction to the contact of the root-syllable with the termination. With these two exceptions, all *-a* verbs form their perfect in *-ui* or *-vi*. Although the Greek vowel-verbs particularly affect the aorist in *-σα*, and indeed have no other, we find that no vowel-verb in Latin has the aorist perfect in *-si*, unless it has dropt in this tense its characteristic vowel—in other words, we have no Latin perfect in *-a-si*, *-e-si*, or *-i-si*. We shall see that there are verbs in *-eo* and *-io*, which drop their characteristic, and have perfects in *-si* immediately attached to the root; but though the characteristic is sometimes dropt in *-a*

verbs, as in *domo*, A. III. *dom-ui*, E. III. *dom-ĭtus*, and though, when the root ends in *v*, the *u* of the perfect is absorbed and represented only by a lengthening of the verb-syllable, as in *jŭv-o*, A. III. *jūv-i*, E. III. *jū-tus*, we never find an *-a* verb which exhibits the aorist-perfect in *-si*. Why this tense has vanished in the first Latin conjugation it is difficult to say, unless we must conclude that it was not euphonious or convenient in the eleven short words, which elide the characteristic *-a*, and in which alone it was possible. These are *crĕpo, cŭbo, dŏmo, frĭco, mĭco, nĕco, plĭco, sĕco, sŏno, tŏno, vĕto*. If we compare these words with the Greek verbs in *-αω*, which have a short *ᾰ* before the *-σ* of the future, we may be led to conclude that in these instances also the *a* was originally followed by some consonant which has been absorbed, and the short vowel in the penultima favours the supposition that we have here the remnants of longer forms. Thus *cubui* belongs to *cumbo*, which is strengthened by *anus-vâra*, as well as to *cŭba-o*, which, like *κύπτω*, may have had some consonantal formative: *crĕpa-o, crĕpui*, may be compared with *strĕpo, strepui*, which has altogether lost the pronominal adjunct of its present tense: *dŏma-o* stands by the side of *δάμ-νη-μι* as well as *δαμά-ζω*. Whether *veto* is to be derived from *vetus* (cf. for the form *vetulus*, and for the sense *antiquo*), or should be compared with *vitium*, it obviously involves some semi-consonantal strengthening of the present tense. Of the regular verbs of the first conjugation, the most troublesome in its etymology is *ploro*, which Döderlein once (*Lat. Syn. u. Et.* III. 155) considered as an intensive form of *plico*, and which he now (*ibid.* VI. p. 273) connects with *pluo, fluo* and *fleo*. I cannot accept either of these etymologies. As far as the signification is concerned there is no reason to suppose that *ploro* ever meant "to shed tears," and such a meaning would be quite inconsistent with the ordinary use of the compound *exploro*. Festus tells us (p. 230, Müller, quoted above, p. 200), that the original meaning of *ploro* was *inclamo* or *invoco;* and with regard to *ploro* he says (p. 79): "*explorare* antiquos pro *exclamare* usos, sed postea prospicere et certum cognoscere cœpit significare. Itaque *speculator* ab *exploratore* hoc distat, quod speculator hostilia silentio perspicit, *explorator* pacata clamore cognoscit;" and the *Glossar. Labb.* explains *endoplorato* by *ἐπικάλεσον*, which is more accurate than the account given by Festus (s. v. p. 77). In a frag-

ment of Varro, quoted by Forcellini, who is unable to verify it, we have: "gemit, *explorat*, turbam omnem concitat," from which it appears that the original meaning of the word must have been "to cry aloud." Now we know that *ad-oro*, which does not signify, as is generally supposed, to put the hands to the mouth, and then stretch them forth in honour of a superior being (προσκυνέω), but rather "to speak to" and "address," is a compound of *ad* and *oro*, just as *alloqui* is a compound of *ad* and *loqui;* and we know (from Festus, pp. 19, 182), that *orator* was originally a name for an ambassador, and that *adorare* meant *agere caussas*. So that *oro* means to make an *oratio* or speech, and emphatically to use the *os* or mouth for the purpose of obtaining something. Hence, it passes into its meaning "to ask" or "pray for," and then becomes nearly synonymous with *ploro* and *imploro*. But if *oro* comes from *os*, why should not *pl-oro* have the same origin? There can be no difficulty about the first two letters, which contain the root of *pl-us*, *pl-erique*, πλ-έος, πολ-ύς, "full;" and the phrases *pleno ore laudare* (Cic. *de Officiis*, I. 18), and *plena voce vocare* (Virg. *Georg.* I. 388), are sufficient to show how *pl-oro* got its original and proper meaning "to cry aloud." Now "to call aloud" for anything is to desire it earnestly and to demand it with importunity; hence in Greek we have such phrases as: βοᾷ λοιγὸν Ἐρινύς (Æsch. *Choëph.* 396), which is equivalent to Shakspere's: "they say it *will have* blood." And in general the idea of asking, which is involved in the etymological analysis of *quæro* (above, p. 352), passes into that of seeking, which is so often and so regularly conveyed by that verb and its compounds. As then *exquiro* has lost all trace of the original meaning of *quæ-so* = *quæ-ro*, "I cause to speak," so *ex-ploro* has quite taken leave of the sense of "calling aloud" originally borne by *ploro*, and means merely "to seek out," so that it is perfectly synonymous with *exquiro*. In a passage of Virgil (*Georg.* I. 175) we find *exploro* used of the searching nature of smoke, which penetrates the smallest apertures, and insinuates itself into the tissue of a substance: "et suspensa focis *explorat* robora fumus." The force of the preposition in *ex-ploro* is merely intensive, as in *ex-quiro*. It has not that sense of effecting and obtaining which we notice in *exoro*, as in Ter. *Andr.* III. 4, 13: "gnatam ut det *oro*, vixque id *exoro:*" and *Hecyra, Prol.* 2, v. 1: "*orator* ad vos venio ornatu prologi:

sinite *exorator* sim." In *deploro* we sometimes have the same use of the preposition which we notice in *de-sidero*, and *de-spero*, and *de* expresses a feeling of loss or absence. With regard to *de-sidero* it may be remarked in passing, that, as *con-templor* and *con-sidero* are augurial terms derived from the observation of the heavenly *templum* and its stars, so *de-sidero* indicates the interruption to the augurial process which was occasioned by a cloudy and starless night. As *pl-oro*, according to the etymology which is here suggested, must have been originally *ple-oro*, and as *plures* is a corruption of the old comparative *ple-ores* (above, Ch. VI. § 2), we see a perfect analogy between the old Norse *fleiri*, Suio-Gothic *flere*, compared with the latter, and the Etruscan *phleres*, which has been derived from the former (above, p. 173). And with respect to the meaning of *phleres*, the connexion of *votum*, which expresses its application, with *voco*, which is a synonym of *ploro*, may be seen in such phrases as Virgil's: "*votis* adsuesce *vocari*" (*Georg.* I. 42), and: "*votis vocaveris* imbrem" (ibid. I. 157). Another verb of the first conjugation which deserves some notice is *futo* found in its compounds *con-futo* and *re-futo*. According to Festus (p. 89), Cato used *futo* as a frequentative of *fuo* or *fio*. But this is not the origin of *futo* as found in these compounds and in the adjective *futilis*, &c. This verb is connected with *futis* (= *vas aquarium*, Varro, p. 47, Müller), and *fundo;* and *con-futo*, *re-futo*, which are frequentatives of *fuo*, whence *fons* and *fundus* (see below, Ch. XIII. § 9), are applied to the act of pouring in cold water with a ladle to prevent the kettle from boiling over; Titinn. *ap. Non.* c. 4. n. 47: "cocus magnum ahenum, quando fervit, paula *confutat* trua," (see Scaliger *ad Fest.* s. v. *refuto;* Ruhnken, *Dict. in Ter.* p. 174). Hence we have such phrases as: *confutare dolores*, "to repress or keep down sorrows" (Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* V. 31).

§ 3. *The second or* -e *Conjugation.*

The first point, which strikes the philological student, when he turns his attention to the second conjugation, is the general tendency to drop the characteristic *e* in the perfect (A. III.), and its participle (E. III.). This is necessarily the case in all verbs which take the proper perfect (*α*) by reduplication, as *mordeo, momordi, morsus;* or the aorist in *-si*, (*β*), as *jubeo, jussi, jussus; lugeo, luxi, luctus;* and when *l* or *r* precedes a guttural in these

verbs, this guttural is omitted in the perfect, as in *fulgeo, ful-si; torqueo, tor-si;* and the same is the case with dentals, whether mute or liquid, as *rideo, risi; hæreo, hæsi;* though *maneo* retains its *n* in the perfect *mansi*. But even where the agglutinate perfect in *-ui* is used, we generally find that the characteristic *e* is dropt before it. Indeed there are only a few cases in which the perfect is formed after the analogy of *ama-vi*. These are *deleo, delevi; fleo, flevi; neo, nevi;* the compounds of *oleo*, as *aboleo, abolevi;* the compounds of *pleo*, as *impleo, implevi;* and the nearly obsolete *vieo, vievi*. The long *e* in these verbs is generally retained in E. III., as *deletus, fletus, impletus;* but *adoleo* has *adultus*, and *aboleo* makes *abolitus*. All other verbs of this conjugation, which take the agglutinate perfect, omit before it the characteristic E, and either drop it also in the participle E. III., or shorten it into *i*. Thus we have *moneo, monui, monĭtus; misceo, miscui, mistus* and *mixtus*. The deponent *reor* takes the stronger vowel *a* in its participle *rătus*, whence *rătio*, but the *i* is resumed in the compound *irrĭtus* = *non ratus*. Verbs ending in *v* generally absorb the *v* of their agglutinate perfect like the corresponding *a* verbs *juvo* and *lavo;* thus we have *caveo, cāvi, cautus; faveo, fāvi, fautus; foveo, fōvi, fōtus; moveo, mōvi, motus; paveo, pāvi; voveo, vōvi, vōtus*. If we compare *mordeo, momordi, morsus* with *prandeo, prandi, pransus; sedeo, sēdi, sessus;* and *video, vīdi, visus;* we shall probably conclude that the latter have merely lost their reduplication. The best explanation, which can be offered of the very general evanescence of the characteristic *e* in the perfects of this conjugation, is to assume that in the majority of instances it was merely one of those adjuncts, which are used for the purpose of strengthening the present and the tenses derived from it. Among these adjuncts not the least common is the second element under the form *ya* (see *New Crat.* §§ 426, 432), and as this is clearly contained in many Greek verbs in *-εω* which are also written *-ιω* (*New Crat.* § 432, γ), so there are many special reasons for inferring the presence of this auxiliary in the Latin verbs in *-eo*. Perhaps the most important of these special reasons is suggested by the phenomenon that many active verbs in Latin, either (*a*) uncontracted, or (*b*) contracted in *-a*, have a neuter or passive verb from the same root distinguished by the formative characteristic *e*; thus we have (*a*)

active *jacĕre*, passive *jacēre*; active *pandĕre*, passive *patēre*; active *pendĕre*, passive *pendēre*; active *scandĕre*, passive *scatēre*; (*b*) active *liquāre*, passive *liquēre*; active *parāre*, *parĕre*, passive *parēre*; active *sedāre*, passive *sedēre*. Now it is well known that the insertion of *ya* between the root and the ending forms the passive voice in Sanscrit (*New Crat.* § 379), and I have shown (ibid. § 381) that a similar explanation is applicable to the Greek passive aorists in *-θην* and *-ην*; and as one of these aorists is ἔστην = ἔστάγαμι, we may conclude that the irregular *stāre*, which is opposed to *sistĕre*, stands for *sta-yere* or *steh-yere* (above, p. 373), and in the same way we shall bring back to this conjugation *fugĕre*, which is similarly opposed to *fugāre*. The next section will point out the distinction between these verbs formed with the pronominal *ya*, and those which have the verb *eo*, as an auxiliary accretion. With regard to those now under consideration, as in the case of the subordinate verb-forms in Hebrew, it depends upon the nature of the primary element whether the verb is intransitive, as in the instances just adduced, or causative, intensive, or frequentative, as in others which might be cited. Thus *mon-eo*, which contains the root *men-* implying thought and recollection (*me-min-i*, &c.), bears a causative meaning. *Hær-eo*, like the Greek *αἰρ-έω*, is an intensive form of a root not unconnected with the Latin *hir*, "a hand;" Umbrian *here*, "to take;" Sanscrit, *hary*, "to love" (see above, pp. 92, 98). The substantive *hæres* or *heres* (*hærēd-* = *hær-vad*, above, p. 122) is connected with this verb, in the sense of "property-dependent," just as in English law there is a distinction of immediate or intermediate derivation between a person who takes by *limitation*, and one who takes by *purchase*, i. e. from the person last seized. It may be doubted whether "hear," *hören*, and their unaspirated derivatives "ear," *ohr*, may not be derived from this root, so that *hæren* will signify "to catch," i. e. a sound. If so, *hæres*, as implying dependence, will approximate in origin and meaning to *cliens*, "the hearer," or *hæriger*, according to Niebuhr's etymology (*H. R.* I. p. 323, note 823). In the verbs *hab-eo* and *ten-eo* the root-meaning is seriously modified by the affix. For *hab-eo* must correspond in root to *gib-a*, *gafa*, "give," and these, as Grimm has shown (*Abh. Ak. Berlin*, 1848), fall back upon *χέω* = *χέϜω* (cf. *ὑφαίνω*, *ὑφή* with O. H. G. *wipu*, *wap*; O. N. *vef*, *vaf*; Sanscr. *vap*;

Engl. "weave"); and the form χιών, which shows a remnant of the F in its ι, is clearly connected with χέFω (see Hom. *Il.* XII. 281: *ὥστε νιφάδες χιόνος πίπτουσι.....κοιμήσας δ' ἀνέμους χέει ἔμπεδον*): similarly, we have χίλιοι from χιλός, "a heap of fodder," also connected with χέω (*New Crat.* § 163). Consequently, the root *hab-* must imply originally rather "to pour out and give," than "to have" or "possess." Similarly, *ten-eo,* which contains the same root as *τα-νύ-ω,* "to stretch out," and *ten-do,* falls back upon the old epic imperative τῆ, "take thou." Although the formative adjunct *ya* has inverted the ideas of giving and taking in *hab-eo* and *ten-eo,* we find that they are only partially kept distinct in the former. Thus, while the root *ten-,* when strengthened by the adjunct *-do,* has quite a different meaning from *ten-eo,* we find that *habeo,* in its compounds *per-hibeo, præbeo = præ-hibeo,* quite reverts to the primitive meaning of the root, for both these words imply a holding forth and giving, as though *præbere* meant *præ se habere* like *præ se ferre,* or *prætendere.* The same is the case with ἔχω (see Arnold on Thucyd. I. 9) and still more with παρέχω, whence comes the technical use of παροχή, "supplying," "furnishing," and the later *parochus,* "a purveyor" (Hor. I. *Serm.* 5, 43), or "entertainer" (id. ibid. II. 8, 36). This technical sense of παρέχω has been overlooked in Thucyd. IV. 39: *βρώματα ἐγκατελήφθη· ὁ γὰρ ἄρχων Ἐπιτάδας ἐνδεεστέρως παρεῖχεν ἢ πρὸς τὴν ἐξουσίαν.* When *habeo* denotes a state or condition it generally takes the reflexive pronoun *se,* where the Greek uses ἔχω absolutely with an adverb in *-ως*: but Sallust (*Cat.* 6) has: "sicuti pleraque mortalium *habentur*" for *se habent.* Metaphysical considerations (*New Crat.* § 53) might lead us to infer that *habeo* not only includes the ideas of holding forth or giving, and of having or keeping, but also conveys the antecedent notion of desiring, under the form *aveo* or *haveo,* which falls back on the Semitic אָהַב or אָוָה. But whatever reason we may have for connecting *habeo* or *haveo* with this Hebrew root, there are two verbs in *-eo,* which strongly support the ethnographical theory respecting the Sclavonism of the old Italians, and their consequent Semitic affinities. These are *deb-eo,* of which I have spoken above (p. 76), and *misc-eo.* The latter, which appears with a medial *auslaut* in the Greek *μίσγω,* is represented under both forms by the Hebrew מָסַךְ and מָזַג (found in the noun מֶזֶג "mixed wine");

compare the Arabic مشى, Sclav. *mjeshu*, Polish *mieszam*, Bohemian *misyti*, Russian *s-mjeshat'*, Persian آميختن, O. H. G. *misc-jan*, Lith. *maiszyti*, Gael. *measgaim*, Sanscr. *miç-ra*, &c. From the extreme antiquity and universal prevalence of this compound root, and from the formative affix with which it appears as a verb in most of the Indo-Germanic languages, it is fair to conclude that its origin is to be sought in a pronominal combination analogous in meaning and form to the Irish *measg*, "among," "between," Welsh *ym-musk*, Greek *με-τά*, *μέ-σφα*, *μέ-χρι*, *μέσσος*, Lat. *me-dius*, Hebrew בְּ־תוֹךְ, which would serve as a sufficient basis for such a causative verb. It has been mentioned above (p. 76), in a general way, that *deb-eo* is connected with the important Semitic and Sclavonian root טוֹב, *dhób*, and *dob*, signifying "good." But it will be necessary in this place to justify this comparison with especial reference to the formative syllable of the conjugation. In its impersonal use, *oportet* corresponds to the personal and impersonal use of *debeo*, and as the former is clearly connected with *opus*, so the latter expresses, as Forcellini says, *rationem officii, convenire, oportere, obstrictum esse ad aliquid faciendum.* In both, the ideas of interest and duty are mixed up, and in general, when we say that *it is good for us* to do anything, we combine in one notion the thought of a moral fitness or propriety and that of an advantage to be gained. We feel that we owe it to ourselves, when we feel that we owe it to our principles or to our fellowmen. Hence, being in debt, which is the reverse of a good thing, is expressed by an application of the verb, which conveys the idea of justice or moral obligation, just as *officium*, "duty," belongs to the same family with *officit*, or *obest*, "it harms." In English we have only one word for what we "owe" and what we "ought to do;" and the German *sollen*, "to be in duty bound" (connected with our "shall," and "should"), belongs to the same root as *schuld*, "a debt." The Greek phrase *δίκαιός εἰμι τοῦτο ποιεῖν*, "I am in justice bound to do this"= "I ought to do it," shows how the two ideas run into one another. But the most decisive illustration of the etymology of *deb-eo* is furnished by the affinity between the Greek *ὀ-φέλλω*, "to increase," "enlarge," "benefit," "aggrandize," *ὄ-φελος*, "advantage," "help," "profit," *ὠ-φελέω*, "to be of service" (all from the root

phel-, "to swell," and all showing the ordinary meaning of טוב and *dob*), and their derivatives ὀφλι-σκ-ά-νω, "to incur an obligation," and ὀ-φείλω=ὀ-φέλ-*yω*, "to owe," the impersonal use of which ὀφείλει, "it is fitting," reverts to the meaning of the other class of words and of the Latin *oportet* and *opus est*. As then ὀ-φείλω=ὀφέλ-*yω*, with the same pronominal adjunct *ya*, forms the expression of duty from that of advantage, so *deb-eo* by the same machinery passes to the same extension of the primitive *dob*, "a fitting time," *dob-ro*, "good, useful," &c.

§ 4. *The third or* -i *Conjugation.*

The best general rule for distinguishing between the verbs in *-io*, which belong to the vowel-conjugation, and those which have for their characteristic the letter *i* considered as a semi-consonant, or vocalization of a guttural, has been already given (§ 1). With regard to their origin and analysis, we must consider the former as an extension of the *-e* conjugation, and while the vowel-verbs in *-io* will thus represent a set of derivatives in which a crude form in *-i* is strengthened by the affix *-ya*, in which case there will always be a contraction, the semi-consonantal verbs, which outwardly resemble them, merely strengthen the present and its immediate offspring with a vocalized guttural, to which the person-endings are attached without any intermediate agency. Thus, as we shall see in the next chapter, all verbs of the third conjugation are derived from nouns actually existing in *-i*, or which may be inferred from the inflexions of existing nouns, while the semi-consonant verbs have no such primitives. We see the manner in which the second conjugation is included in the third, from a verb of the second conjugation, of which the root happens to end in the vowel *-i*, and which, therefore, is liable to the double contraction observable in all genuine *i* verbs. From the root *ci-* (Greek κί-ω) we have, with an entire correspondence of meaning, two forms *ci-eo* and *ci-o*, and as the perfect is always *cīvi*, we must consider the latter as a condensation of the former. The great peculiarity of this verb is that its participle (E. III.) is indifferently *cītus* or *cĭtus*, the latter being found not only in compounds like *concĭtus*, *incĭtus*, *percĭtus*, but also in the simple form *cĭtus*, both when it is used as a participle, as in Virgil (*Æneid.* VIII. 642):

> Haud procul inde *citæ* Metium in diversa quadrigæ
> Distulerant,

where we must take *citæ* with *in diversa*, "chariots moved in different directions;" and also when it appears as a simple adjective signifying "swift." The short penultima is contrary to all rule; for the participle of *ci-eo* must be *ci-ĭtus*=*cītus*; and we can only explain it as a result of Roman abbreviation. But the existence of the forms *cieo* and *cio* is quite sufficient to prove the fact, for which I contend, that true verbs in *-i* include the formative in *-e*. And in the next chapter I shall show that, as I have mentioned above (§ 1), the same remark applies also to the *a* verbs. To this rule, respecting the *i* verbs, there are only two exceptions—the verb *eo* (root *i*) and the verb *queo* (root *quen-* or *kon-*). These two verbs are distinguished from the regular verbs in *i* by their omission of the *e* in the imperfect *ibam*, *quibam*, and by the adoption of the agglutinate form in the futures *i-bo*, *qui-bo*. With regard to the former point, although we have occasional exceptions in the poets, as *lenibat*, *polibant*, &c., we generally find that the imperfect of the *i* verb ends in *-iebam*, as *audi-e-bam*; and in this particular it is imitated by the semi-consonant verb in *i*, which gives *capiebam*, *faciebam*, *fugiebam*, &c. With regard to the future, we rarely, if ever, find an *-i* verb which follows the analogy of *ibo*, *quibo*; but in almost every case we have the subjunctive form in *-am* (*-es*, *-et*, &c.), which is invariably adopted by the consonant verbs. The substitution of *e* for *i* in the verb *eo*, which does not involve the formative element of the second conjugation, leads to some momentary confusion with the *e-* verb, in those instances in which *eo* is used as an agglutinate auxiliary to express the passive of certain compounds of *do* and *facio*, just as the *-eo* verb stands as the corresponding intransitive to verbs merely differing from it in conjugation. Thus we have *inter-eo*, "I go between," i. e. vanish, by the side of *inter-ficio*, "I cause to go between," i. e. make away with; *per-eo*, "I go through," i. e. disappear, by the side of *per-do*, "I put through," i. e. annihilate; and similarly, *pessum-do* (cf. πέρθω); *ven-eo* (=*venum eo*), "I go for sale," i. e. "I am sold," by the side of *ven-do* (=*venum-do*), "I put up for sale," and *ven-dico* or *vin-dico* (=*venum-dico*), "I declare for sale." But the confusion is only instantaneous, for the first comparison shows that these verbs are distinguished from the neuter verbs mentioned above (as *pateo*, *pendeo*, *sedeo*) both by the conjugation of the present

(in *-eo, -es, -et*, &c., not *-eo, -is, -it*, &c.) and by the form of the perfect (which is never in *-ivi*). On the other hand, we must distinguish the causative verbs in *-do*, Greek *-θω*, from the aorist formations in *-θην, -ην*, which involve the element *ya*, and have precisely the converse meaning. Of these latter forms enough has been said elsewhere (*New Crat.* §§ 379, sqq.). I will only remark in passing, that the explanation of these forms will not justify the monstrosity *ἐγρηγόρθασι*, in which all the grammarians have acquiesced. As this word rests only on a single passage (Hom. *Il.* X. 419) and as the context shows (cf. *Il.* VII. 371; XVIII. 299) that the true reading is:

> οἱ δ' ἐγρήγορθαί τε φυλασσέμεναί τε κέλονται
> ἀλλήλοις,

the portentous *ἐγρηγόρθασι* should be expunged from all dictionaries and grammars. The 2nd pers. plur. *ἐγρήγορθε*, and the infin. *ἐγρήγορθαι* are easily justifiable. But to return to the Latin verbs in *-i*, while we observe an obstinate retention of the characteristics in all other inflexions, we not unfrequently find that the perfect and its participle (E. III.) are formed as from the naked root. Thus from *amic-io* we have *amixi, amic-tus*, from *aper-io, aper-ui, aper-tus*, from *haur-io, hau-si, haus-tus*, from *sent-io, sen-si, sen-sus*, from *ven-io, vēn-i, ven-tus*. In all these cases we may conclude that the sense of completion borne by the perfect has enabled it to dispense with the elongating appendage of the present and its subordinate forms.

§ 5. *The fourth or Consonant Conjugation.*

A. *Mute Verbs.*

Mute verbs, whether their characteristic be labial, guttural, or dental, do not exhibit any peculiarities of inflexion, which call for detailed examination. The perfect is generally either the reduplicative form (*a*) or the aorist in *-si*; the reduplication is sometimes represented merely by lengthening the root-syllable, as in *scăbo, scābi, lĕgo, lēgi*; sometimes the first syllable is omitted without compensation, as is *fĭdi, scĭdi*; and this is always the case in compounds, as *cădo, cecĭdi*, but *concĭdo, concĭdi*. *Bibo*, which is reduplicated in the present, can have no further reduplication in its perfect, which is accordingly *bĭbi*. The few verbs which have an agglutinate perfect in *-fui* must have borrowed this

lost form of the vowel-conjugation. We are able to justify this surmise by comparing *cumbo, cubui* with *cubo.* And of course the same explanation must apply to *strepo, -is, strepui,* compared with *crepo, -as, crepui, frendo, -is, frendui,* compared with *strideo,* &c. The verbs *peto* and *rudo,* which form their perfect and its participle as from a verb in *-i,*—namely, *petivi, petītus; rudīvi, rudītus;*—are shown by this fact alone to be weakened forms of original verbs, in which the vowel *i* appeared; and this inference is confirmed by their etymology: for there can be no doubt that *peto* is identical with the Gothic *bid-jan,* Greek πείθω=πίθ-yω, whence πτ-ωχός and the Italian *pit-occo.* Now if the primary meaning of this root is "to fall down" and "make an inclination," like the Hebrew בָּרַךְ, "to make a reaching towards another," so that the root will be contained in *pe*[*d*]*-s,* πί-πτ-ω, πέδ-ον, *fotus,* "foot," the present must have required the strengthening observed in πείθω = πίθ-yω, and presumed in *peto=pet-yo.* It is also clear that *rudo* is only another form of *rugio,* which has passed into *rudio;* compare the Gothic *rauhts* = "fremitus," with the Greek ῥόθος, ῥοθεῖν, ῥύζειν, γρύζειν, &c. Several of the consonant verbs strengthen the root in the present tense and its derivatives by a nasal insertion analogous to the Sanscrit *anusvâra:* but this insertion is never retained in the perfect, if this tense is or was formed by reduplication; thus we have *pu-n-go, pupŭgi, ru-m-po, rūpi, fra-n-go, frēgi, tu-n-do, tutŭdi, sci-n-do, scĭdi,* &c. The same rule applies to *n,* when it is appended to the root, for in this case also it appears to be inconsistent with reduplication, not only in the Greek and Latin, but also in their elder sister the Sanscrit, and in the Sclavonian, which furnished the Pelasgian element to both of them. Thus we have *da-dâmi,* but *ap-nômi;* δίδωμι, τίθημι, ἵστημι, but ζεύγ-νυμι, δάμ-νημι, ἱκ-νέομαι; πί-πτω for πι-πέτω, but πίτ-νω; *bibo,* but πί-νω; and, as we shall see, *sper-no,* but *spre-vi, contem-no,* but *contemp-si.* In Sclavonian there is a particular class of verbs, which the grammarians call semel-factive, and in which this *nu* is the distinctive mark. As then the reduplication clearly denotes iterative or continuous action, we must conclude that *n* is in these cases the pronominal element denoting separation and distance, which is opposed to the idea of abiding presence connected with that of continuance. Whereas in those cases in which the perfect formation retains the

-n, as in *jungo*, *junxi*, *fungor*, *functus sum*, &c., we may infer that the *n* is merely euphonic, or intended to express, in conjunction with the guttural, the sound of the Semitic ע (See *Report of the British Association* for 1851, p. 148). Most of the Greek verbs in *-τω* exhibit the *τ-* as a pronominal adjunct of the same kind with the *-ν-* which has just been mentioned: compare *τύπ-τω*, *τίκ-τω* with *τέμ-νω*, *δάκ-νω*, &c. We may come to the same conclusion with regard to the Latin verbs in *-to*, as *flec-to* from the root *flac-* in *flaccidus*, &c. As *n* is opposed to the continuous or iterative meaning of the verb, it may seem surprising that the most common Latin frequentatives end in *-ito*; but these, as we shall see in the next chapter, are derivatives of a very different kind. Of the Latin verbs in *-to*, *-tis*, &c., the most instructive is *ver-to*. The ideas of turning, changing, and beginning to be, have a common source, and refer themselves to one conception in the mind. It is difficult to say which is the primary modification of the thought. Perhaps the word *vertumnus*, which has long been recognised as a participial form from *verto*, will lead us most easily to the primary meaning of the root. It is usual to consider the Etruscan deity *Vertumnus* as the god of the autumn or of the ripe fruits (so Creuzer, *Symb.* III. 665); but the co-existence of the word *auctumnus* shows that this cannot be the correct view of the matter. As the husband of *Pomona*, the summer-goddess, *Vertumnus* begets *Cæculus*, the darkening time of the year, and must therefore, in himself, be a personification of the spring, *ver*, which is actually included in his name. For *ver=ver-t* (Fεαρ-τ) is the period when the germs of the fruits first come into being (compare *wes-en* with *wer-den*), and this, as the beginning of new life, is a change from the previous state of decay and non-existence. We may say that *Vertumnus* (or *Vertunnus*, cf. *Neptunus* for *Neptumnus*) is the year when "it changes itself," or puts on a new dress; and as the *aura Favoni*, in the language of Lucretius, is not only *reserata*, or released from its former bondage in the dungeons of winter, but also *genitabilis*, or the cause of birth, we may see that *Vertumnus*, the god of change (Ovid. *Fast.* VI. 410; Prop. IV. 2, 10; Horat. II. *Serm.* 7, 14), is also the representative of the generation or birth of the fruits, which lie fecundating under the care of Pomona, until they spring up into the *Auctumnus=Auctomenos* or growing year. Thus the Hebrew

חֹרֶף, which denotes the autumn, is used as an expression for maturity, as in *Job* XXIX. 4; and if the same root indicates also a falling away, decadence, and consequent reproach, we only come to the idea suggested by *Cæculus*, another expression for the Autumn, as the child of Vertumnus and Pomona. The Umbrian Propertius (IV. 2, 46) expressly tells us that the name of Vertumnus was explicable in the Etruscan language; for he says:

> At mihi, quod formas unus *vertebar* in omnes,
> Nomen ab eventu *patria lingua* dedit,—

and that this *patria lingua* must be Etruscan (i. e. in this case Pelasgian) is clear from the beginning of the Elegy (v. 3):

> Tuscus ego, et Tuscis orior: nec pœnitet inter
> Prœlia Volsinios deseruisse focos.

And Varro expressly tells us that he was a chief divinity with those Etruscans who came with Cœlius Vibenna (*L. L.* V. 46, p. 18, Müller): "ab iis dictus *Vicus Tuscus*, et ideo ibi Vertumnum stare, quod is Deus Etruriæ princeps." From this we learn that the Pelasgian religion was peculiarly distinguished by its elementary character (above, p. 36), and that *ver-to*, and consequently *auc-to*, were Pelasgo-Tyrrhenian words. In its middle sense, *vertor* often appears in the compound *re-vertor*, "I turn myself back or return." The verb *rego*, which, as we have seen (above, p. 76), has important affinities with the Greek, Sclavonian, and even the Semitic languages, is never used as a deponent to signify motion in a straight line, like the Greek ἔ-ρχ-ομαι, nor is it used as a neuter verb like τ-ρέχω, and yet the term *regio* or *regio viarum* expressly denotes the straight course or direction, like the ἀνομένων βημάτων ὄ-ρεγμα of Æschylus (*Choëph.* 799). The uncompounded verb *lego* has the perfect *lēgi*, which is undoubtedly a remnant of reduplication; but in the derivative forms, such as *intel-ligo*, "I make a discrimination," i. e. I understand, *diligo*, "I make a choice," i. e. I prefer or love, *neg-ligo*, "I make no option," i. e. I leave behind neglected, we have only the aorist in *-si*, as *intellexi*, *dilexi*, *neglexi*. But we have also *intellēgi*, *neglēgi*, and conversely *collexi*, in the older writers (see Lachmann, *ad Lucret.* VI. 17). This aorist revives the lost guttural of the present tense in *fluo*, *fluxi*, in *struo*, *struxi*, in *vivo*, *vixi*, and in *fruor*, *fructus sum*; and strengthens an ultimate guttural in *traho*, *traxi*, and *veho*, *vexi*.

§ 6. B. *Liquid Verbs.*

Some of the verbs, which have *l* for their characteristic, double this letter in the present tense, but not in the perfect, thus we have *pello, pepuli, pulsus,* &c. The analogy of *ille, alius,* &c., would lead us to infer that these verbs belong strictly to the semi-consonant class, and the singular participle *tlatus* or *latus* from *tollo, tetuli,* coupled with the Greek form τλάω, would almost suggest the idea that there was once a collateral verb in *-a.* There are only two *n* verbs, the reduplicated *gigno,* root *gen-,* perfect *genui,* and *cano,* perfect *cecini.* But the known relationship between *ille, alius* and ἀνά, together with the meanings of *alo, al-mus, al-u-mnus,* which imply "bringing *up*," suggest the possibility that this verb may have belonged originally to the same form of the liquid characteristic. We have seen above that *l* and *n* are both dentals, and that they are frequently interchanged. Although *s* is by its origin a result of the gutturals, it often passes into the dental *r;* and there can be little doubt that most of the verbs in *r* and *s* must be placed in the same category. Indeed it has been suggested that *sero, serui* is merely a reduplication for *seso.* While the other liquids are all capable of some connexion with the dental articulation, the labial *m* stands apart from any interchange with the other letters of this class, except in the case of an assimilation, as in *pressi* from *premo* (cf. *jubeo, jussi*). The most important and remarkable of the *m* verbs is *emo,* which is worthy of special examination, not only on its own account, but also on account of its numerous compounds. The primary meaning of *emo* is, "I take up or select," and thus it comes very near in signification to *lego.* This idea of selection lies at the root of the ordinary meaning of *emo,* "I buy;" for this presumes a selection from a variety of objects offered for sale. In our own colloquial English, "I will take this," is the usual phrase for expressing an intention to purchase some particular article. The Greek πρίαμαι appears as the middle of πιπράσκω, "I cause to pass over;" and the two together express the changing of hands (πέραν) which always attends a sale. And as ἀποδίδομαι means, "I give away for my own benefit," i. e. "I part with a thing on advantageous terms," so ὠνέομαι (from the same root as ὀν-ίνημι) declares the fact that the purchaser finds his benefit in the transaction. A

recent theological writer has remarked that "the verb *emo*, which signifies literally 'to select for use' (whence *amor* and its derivative *am[a]o*, cf. *diligo*), is employed in its compounds *promo* and *sumo* to denote the use made of the selected articles, or of the money which is their representative; these must be *in promptu* before they can be *in sumptu*, they must be κτήματα before they can be χρήματα. Hence *promptus* is the primary as well as the secondary synonym of ἑτοῖμος." When we recollect that the compounds *ad-imo, ex-imo, inter-imo*, give us the *i*, which presumes an *a* in the weaker form (as in *con-ficio*, from *facio*, &c., above, p. 261), we are entitled to suppose that *emo* represents a primary *amo, amis*, and a secondary *em-io;* (comp. *ten-eo, con-tin-eo*, with τά-ω, τα-νύ-ω, &c.). We shall see in the next chapter that *amor* presumes an original *am-ior*, and that *am[a]o* suggests a form *am-a* = *am-ya* which is included in *amor=am-ior*, formed from the genitive case of such a noun. It is usual to connect *amor* with the Sanscrit *kâma*, which corresponds to it in meaning. But as the analysis now before us shows that "love" is a secondary meaning, derived from that of "selection," we may leave out of the question any results arising from this immediate comparison; and as the Greek πρί-αμαι, πι-πρά-σκω, are manifestly connected with the pronominal combination πέ-ρα-ν or πα-ρά, signifying a transit, we may compare *a-ma* with ἄ-μα, *sa-ma, cu-m*, which express union or conjunction, and hence appropriation (*New Crat.* § 181), and bring us ultimately to the most probable origin of the Sanscrit *kâma*. It is worth noticing that the Greek ἀ-σπάζομαι, "I draw to myself," really includes in its prefix this pronominal combination (*New Crat.* § 213), and the same is the case with *am-plector* and *com-plector*. No difficulty will be created by the fact that we have a compound *co-emo*, in the secondary sense, "I buy up." It would be paying too great a compliment to the etymological knowledge of the Romans to suppose that they dreamt of an affinity between the preposition *cum*, and the root of *emo;* and even if this had been so, the repetition of the same elements under different forms would have been in accordance with the oldest examples of pronominal agglutination. The perfect of *ĕmo*, is *ēmi*, and this form is retained by the compounds, except when the prepositional prefix coalesces with the first syllable of the verb: thus we have *adēmi, exēmi, interēmi*, but *dēmo=*

de-emo makes *dem-p-si*, *prōmo* = *pro-emo* makes *prom-p-si*, *sūmo* = *su-emo* makes *sum-p-si*; and while *co-emo*, "I buy up," makes *co-ēmi*, *co-emptus*, the same verb in the older sense, "I take and put together," i. e. the hair, makes *cōmo*, *com-p-si*, *com-p-tus*.

§ 7. C. *Semi-consonantal Verbs.*

It has been already mentioned that the vowel-verbs in *-i* differ from the semi-consonantal forms, which they so nearly resemble, both in the origin and in the extent of the pronominal adjunct by which they are qualified. For while the vowel *i-* verb involves not only a crude form in *-i*, but a repetition of the same pronominal element, the semi-consonantal *i-* verb uses this adjunct merely to strengthen the present tense and its immediate derivatives, and loses all traces of it in those formations in which a contraction is most conspicuous, namely, in the second person singular of A. I., and in the present infinitive. Thus, while we have, from the crude form of *ves-ti-s*, *vesti-o* = *vesti-yo*, *vestī-s* = *vesti-is*, and *vestīre* = *vesti-yere*, the mere root *fac-* gives us *fac-io* = *fac-yo*, *fac-ĭs* and *fac-ĕre*. As *cupio* has a perfect *cupīvi* and derivatives like *cupīdo*, we may perhaps be inclined to consider *cupĕre* as a degenerate form, and to refer this verb to the vowel-conjugation; and this opinion might be confirmed by its relation to *capio*. For, according to a principle pointed out elsewhere (*New Crat.* § 53), *capio* and *cupio* are related by the association of contrast; and the shorter vowel *u* shows that the latter is a longer form than *capio*; but this implies that *cupio* = *capi-yo*, which is in accordance with the theory respecting the *i-* verbs. In all other verbs, however, which form the present in *-io* and the infinitive in *-ere*, it is plain that there is only one affection of the root with a formative appendage, and the nature of this adjunct is clearly seen in the case of *fug-io*. For there can be no doubt that we have here the root *fug-*, and that the same root is found in φεύγω, aor. ἔ-φυγ-ον, where it is strengthened by *guna* (*New Crat.* § 442), and in φυ-γ-γά-νω, where it is not only strengthened by *anusvâra*, but supported by an additional nasal (ibid. § 435). To the same class as φυγγάνω we must refer the deponent *fu-n-gor*, "I make myself quit of," "get fairly away from," "discharge" or "perform." And from a comparison of these cognate verbs with *fug-io*, we

see that it is affected only with a single formative adjunct, which is the same as that which is assimilated in the Greek ψάλλω, and transferred to the root-syllable in φθείρω, root φθαρ-, φαίνω, root φα-, κρῑ́νω root κρῐ̄- (*New Crat.* § 432). With regard to the *u-* verbs, the known derivation of many of them, and the termination of the participle (E. III.) in *-ūtus* or *-uitus*, shows that they are abridgments or degenerate forms of *e-* verbs. Thus it is clear that *metu-o* comes from *metu-s*, *tribu-o* from *tribu-s*, &c.; and as the verbs are thus connected with crude forms of the semi-consonantal declensions, they require in addition another pronominal adjunct, and thus stand in the same relation to the genuine semi-consonant verbs in *-u*, such as *ruo*, *ruere*, *rŭtus*, that the vowel *i-* verbs bear to the semi-consonantal verbs in *i*. As the *i* is after all a representative of some guttural, those apparently *u-* verbs, which exhibit their guttural characteristic in the perfect, as *struo*, *struxi*, *structus*, do not essentially differ from those, which, like *metuo*, have absorbed the element *ya*.

§ 8. *Irregular Verbs.* A. *Additions to the Present Tense.*

From the formations, which we have just discussed, and in which the second element, under the modification *i* = *ya*, plays so prominent a part, there is an immediate transition to the first class of the so-called irregular verbs, which strengthen the present by the addition of one or more actual consonants. As far as the epithet "irregular" is concerned, we have seen that there are deviations from perfect uniformity even in those conjugations which we take as the type of the Latin verb; and it is only in consequence of an excess in the degree of deviation that we are induced to place the verbs with a consonantal accretion in a class by themselves. The additions, by which the present is strengthened in these verbs, are the liquid N, which in a solitary instance appears also as R, and the combination SC. The former of these adjuncts may or may not be the same with the inserted *anusvâra*, which we find in *jungo*, root *jug-*, *fungor* root *fug-*. It is possible that such a nasal may have resulted from euphony; on the other hand, the manner, in which the adjuncts *-νι*, *-νυ* are melted down so as to combine themselves with the root, e. g. in φαίνω = φά-νγω (root φα-), ἐλαύνω = ἐλα-νύω, (root ἐλα-), renders it possible that the addition may be pronominal or formative. And this view is confirmed by the fact (noticed

above, p. 385), that the inserted nasal seems, like the added *n*, to be inconsistent with reduplication (cf. *ru-m-po*, *rūpi*, &c.). We do not find, in Latin as in Greek, that the adjunct *n* coexists with the inserted *n*, as in *τυ-γ-χά-νω*, *λα-μ-βά-νω*, &c., or with the appended *sc*, as in *ὀφλι-σκ-ά-νω*, &c. Many of the Latin forms in *n* have corresponding verbs in Greek; thus we have *cer-no* by the side of *κρίνω* = *κρί-νγω*, *s-per-no* (cf. *as-per-nor*) by the side of *πέρ-νημι*, *ster-no* by the side of *στορέ-ννυμι*, and *tem-no* by the side of *τέμ-νω*. With regard to *tem-no* and *s-per-no*, which are nearly synonymous in Latin, we know from the word *temp-lum*, referring to the actual divisions of a field or the imaginary regions of the sky (*τέμενος*), and from *temp-us* referring to the divisions of time (cf. *καιρὸς* from *κείρω*, which is equivalent to *μέτρον*: see note on Pind. *Ol.* IX. 38[1]), that the primary meaning of the root *tem-* in Latin as in Greek must be "to cut off." And as *πέρ-νημι* means "to export," or "sell," we see that *s-per-no* or *as-per-nor* only carries the idea of separation into that of rejection. With regard to *cer-no* and *κρί-νω* it is worthy of remark, that while they agree in expressing their primary idea, "separation," or the sifting out of that which is mixed up in confusion, they fall back, by the association of contrast, to an agreement with *κερά-ννυμι*, "to mix," (see *New Crat.* § 53). From the primary meaning "to see or distinguish," that of "selection, choice, or judgment," naturally flows; and we find that *cer-no* by itself, and in its compound *de-cer-no*, accords in this respect with the common use of *κρίνω*. This is particularly observable in the idiom *cernere hæreditatem*, "to declare oneself (as distinguished from all others) lawful heir to an estate," as Varro says (*L. L.* VII. § 98, p. 158, Müller): "apud Plautum (*Cistell.* I. 1, 1):

Quia ego antehac te amavi et mihi amicam esse *crevi*,

crevi valet *constitui*; itaque heres, quom constituit se heredem esse, dicitur cernere, et quom id fecit *crevisse*." How far *cer-no* is connected (as Varro thinks, *L. L.* VI. § 81) with *creo*, Sanscr.

---

[1] To what is there said I may add that the Hebrew קָצַץ, which the LXX. translate *καιρός*, is derived from קָצַץ, *cæd-ere*, "to cut;" that in English we speak of the "nick" of time, i. e. of a small portion *cut* off; that *tempero* means "to put in a proper proportion;" and that Hesiod says (*O. et D.* 692): *μέτρα φυλάσσεσθαι, καιρὸς δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἄριστος.*

krĭ-, is perhaps not easily determined. The most interesting of the verbs, in which *n* appears as an adjunct, are *li-no* and *si-no*, for these two, as has been said more than once, play an important part as agglutinate auxiliaries. The common meaning of *li-no* is "to besmear," i. e. "to overlay with something adhesive." This cannot, however, be the primary meaning of so simple a root. It is much more reasonable to conclude that the first signification is simply to *lay* down, and thus it will furnish us with the element of the O. N. *lata* and its Etruscan correlative (above, p. 178). We shall also find in this an explanation of a number of Scandinavian and Sclavonian forms, into which *l-* enters as a verbal adjunct, and, what is of more importance to our immediate object, we shall see in this the origin of the Latin verbs in *-lo*, as *cavillor* = *caver*[*e*]-*lor*, "I *let* myself take care," i. e. "I raise cautious objections or special pleas for myself," *conscribillo* = *conscriber*[*e*]-*lo*, "I *let* write," "I indulge in it at random," *sorbillo* = *sorber*[*e*]-*lo*, "I *let* sip," "I indulge in sipping," &c. As all these verbs belong to the *a-* conjugation, we must recognise in them an extension by means of *i-*, and this is necessary to explain *li-no*, A. III. *lē-vi*, *si-no*, A. III. *si-vi*, *se-ro*, A. III. *sē-vi*. A conclusive proof of the truth of this theory is furnished by the adjective *lentus*, for it contains both the assumed primary meaning of *li-no*, and its common secondary signification. The form shows that it is an elongated participle, and while we have *opu-lentus*, *vio-lentus*, &c., we have also *opu-lens*, *vio-lens*, &c. Now the first meaning of this participle is "laid down" or "lying down," as *lentus in umbra* (Virg. *Buc.* I. 4); hence it denotes "sluggish" or "heavy," and this is its meaning in the compounds just mentioned; then it signifies adhesive; and finally it implies that which is pliant, i. e. that which yields without breaking. Now all these meanings of the participle *lens* are implied or included in *leo*, *lao*, or *li-no;* and thus we can have no doubt as to the meaning of the verb. It has been mentioned already (p. 184), that the solitary form *se-ro*, A. III. *sē-vi*, as distinguished from *ser-o*, *ser-ui*, is merely a modification of *si-no*, *si-vi*. This is susceptible of a very easy proof. For the form of the perfect shows that *r* is an adjunct; and in the pronominal affixes *r* is only a form of *n*. Consequently there is only the same difference between *si-nō*, *si-vi;* *se-ro*, *sē-vi;* as between *temper-im* and the later *temper-em*. The root of each is *si-* or

se-, which bears the same relation to "set," that "lay" does to "let," or the *lao, leo,* just examined, to the Scandinavian *lata. Se-ro,* O. N. *sa* or *sôa,* Goth. *saian,* O. H. G. *saan,* N. H. G. *sâen,* Engl. "sow," merely means to *set* in the ground. And the more original form *si-no* denotes leaving or setting down in general. Hence comes the idea of allowing or suffering to be done—and finally, the causative meaning flows from that of leaving to be done by others: for the master or employer by leaving undone presumes the active employment of his substitute. A further modification is occasioned by a transference of person: and an action is predicated with reference to its object, as when a German says *sich hören lassen,* of a man who makes a speech, and *lets* others hear him, or when a Roman says *quæ-so,* "I *let* another person speak," meaning "I put a question to him." The general signification of *so* for *si-no,* in compounds like *ar-cesso,* "I *let* approach," i. e. "I send for," *capesso,* "I *let* myself take," i. e. "I undertake," &c., has been shown in the last chapter, where it has been adduced as an illustration of the composite tenses of the regular verb. It is rather remarkable that Bopp, who first suggested the true explanation of the composite tenses, and whom I have had to censure on more than one occasion[1] for a theory of agglutinate forms carried beyond the reasonable limits of philological deduction, should still be among the number of those who are unable to see that the verbs in *-sso, -ssivi* make the addition of *si-no.* He would compare these forms with the Sanscrit denominatives in *sya, asya,* and with certain imitations of the Greek derivative verbs such as *atticisso, patrisso,* &c. (*Vergleich. Gramm.* § 775, p. 1066). But in the latter case, the verb is always of the first conjugation in *-a,* and not only have we corresponding forms in *-zo* directly derived from the Greek (as *patrizo* for *patrisso*), but we know that *ss* generally stands for a Greek ζ (above, p. 81). Besides, we cannot explain any of the verbs under consideration as desiderative forms, and if the obvious analysis of *arcesso* with its two orthographies, and *quæso,* with its included *qua-ere* from [*in*]-*quam,* were not sufficient to demonstrate that the *-so, -sivi* stand for *sino, sivi,* we could appeal to a case in which the verb *sino,* independently compounded with a preposition, has suffered a still

[1] See *New Crat.* §§ 368, 379, above, Ch. XI. § 16.

more striking mutilation. There can hardly, I think, be a doubt that *pô-no*, (*po-sui*), stands for *po-s-no*; and as the perfect occurs under the form *po-sivi*, as in Plaut. *Trinumm.* I. 2, 108:

Mihi quod credideris, sumes ubi *posiveris*,

and as in this and other passages *po-sino*, "I lay down," is opposed to *sumo=suemo*, "I take up," it is clear that *pono* is merely a mutilated form of this verb *sino* compounded with the preposition *po* in *po-ne*, *po-st*, &c. But if we must recognise *sino*, *sivi*, in *pono*, *ponis*, *po-sui*, surely it is more clearly discernible in *capesso*, *capessis*, *capes-sivi*. Bopp's explanation is faulty on every account—the invariable *i* before the termination, the *a*- form of the verb, the later or Greek origin of the inflexion, the interchange of *ss* and *z* in existing specimens—all contribute to show that *atticisso*, *-as*, &c., do not belong to the same class with *capesso*, *-is*, *expugnassere*, &c.; and the signification of these latter verbs, their form, and the analogy of the old languages of Italy, all conspire to prove that the analysis which I have suggested is true. I must be permitted to add, that the value of the discovery is materially enhanced by the fact that it lies deep enough to have eluded the search of one of the first comparative philologers of the day, who has been unable to see the most important example of the accretion of verb-forms, although he has abused in other respects a similar theory of agglutination. The other affix, used for strengthening the present, namely *sc*, generally gives an inchoative meaning, and is therefore, by the nature of the case, as entirely excluded from the perfect as the affix N. In most instances the perfect follows the model of a corresponding vowel-verb, whether real or possible; thus we have *cre-sco*, *cre-vi*, (to be distinguished from the accidentally coincident perfect of *cer-no*), *concupi-sco*, *concupivi* (cf. *cupio*), *contice-sco*, *con-ticui* (cf. *taceo*), *exarde-sco*, *exar-si* (cf. *ardeo*), *no-sco*, *no-vi*, *sci-sco*, *sci-vi*, &c. But although we have *pa-sco*, *pa-vi*, the origin of the appendage seems to be forgotten in the compounds, and *compesco*, *compescui*, &c., treat the whole crude form as though it were an independent root. The same is also the case with *posco*, *poposci*, where the original *proc-sco* is quite assimilated and forgotten. Otherwise we must have had in the reduplication a regular form of the simple root as in *di-dic-i* from *disco=dic-sco*. The semi-consonantal *facio* retains the *i* in its inchoative deponent

pro-fic-i-scor, "I cause myself to set forth," i. e. "I set out," and the perfect *profectus sum* falls back on the form of the primitive participle. Some consonantal verbs strengthen the present with *i* before they assume the inchoative affix; thus, from *gemo*, we have *gem-i-sco*, from *tremo*, *trem-i-sco*, from *vivo*, *re-viv-i-sco* (perf. *revixi*); from the root *nac*, *na-n-c-iscor*, *nactus sum*, from *pa-n-go*, *pac-i-scor*, *pactus sum*. The peculiar verb *ob-liv-i-scor* (from *livor*, *liveo*, *livescor*) meaning "I make a black mark for myself," "I obliterate," "I forget," has the perfect *ob-li-tus sum*. The forms which I have mentioned have either simply verbal roots, or corresponding verbs without this affix. But there are some which are apparently derived from substantives, as *arbor-e-sco*, *ir-a-scor*, *puer-a-sco*, *tener-a-sco*, &c. It must be clear, however, to any philologer, that we must in these cases assume an intermediate verb in *-ya* (=*ao* or *eo*). And while we find this supported in particular cases by substantives and adjectives like *arbor-e-tum*, *i-r-ā-tus*, &c., the fact, that there must have been many such vowel-verbs which are now extinct, is shown by the appearance of many adjectives in *-atus*, *-itus*, *-utus*, derived from nouns, but with the meaning of passive participles; such as *barbā-tus*, "bearded," *aurī-tus*, "long-eared," *cornū-tus*, "horned," and many adverbs in *-tim*, with an active participial meaning, as *catervā-tim*, "troopingly," *furtim*, "stealingly," &c. (above, p. 289). The passive form of these participial words implies that the vowel-verb, to which they are referred, is transitive, and in point of fact we find that *cre-sco*, "I am being made," stands in this relation to *creo;* see Virg. *Georg.* II. 336: "prima *crescentis* origine mundi." With singular inconsistency, Bopp, who cannot see any agglutinate form in the verbs in *-so*, *-sivi*, in the very next page assumes that these inchoatives include *esco* the obsolete future of the substantive verb, quite overlooking the fact that this form also remains to be accounted for, and that it cannot be explained otherwise than by concluding that *esco=es-sco* is the inchoative of *es-um*, Sanscr. *as-mî*. For my own part, I have not the least doubt that *sc* in these Latin inchoatives, in the corresponding Greek verbs in *-σκω*, and in the iterative or inchoative tenses in *-σκον*, is a pronominal affix, springing from a repetition of the idea of proximity (*New Crat.* §§ 386, 7). Whether we say at once that *s+c* is a junction of two forms of the same element,

like the common endings $n+t$, $t+n$, or identify it with the affix *sy* found in the Sanscrit future, and in the Greek and Latin desideratives, the result will be the same, for $s=i=k$ come to an ultimate agreement as forms of the second pronominal element. As pronominal elements and their combinations appear also as verb-roots (as e. g. μεν- in μένω, θα- in τιθημι, &c.), we shall have no difficulty in recognising the reduplication *sc*, with its inchoative and iterative meaning, in "a large class of words of which the general idea is that of the inequality of the limbs" (Kenrick, *Herod.* p. 24), or rather which denote progression by successive steps; such as σκέλος, *sca-ndo*, &c.

§ 9. B. *Abbreviated forms.*

Most of the abbreviated forms, or the verbs which are liable to syncope in certain of their inflexions, have received sufficient notice already. *Possum* for *potis-sum* or *pot'sum* is merely an assimilation. The perfect *pot-ui* may be referred to the same class as the other agglutinate perfects. The omission of *d* in certain inflexions of *edo* belongs to an analogy which is particularly observable in the Romance languages (above, pp. 256,7). The same may be said of *vis* for *volis*, *malo* for *mage'volo*, &c. There are, however, some etymological peculiarities about *fero*, which deserve a special examination, independently of the fact that it borrows its perfect *tuli* for *tetuli*, and its participle *latus* for *tlatus* or *toltus*, from the root of *tollo*, *tolyo* or *tlao*. No difficulty is suggested by an immediate comparison of *fer-o* with the Greek φέρ-ω, Sanscr. *bhŕ*, O. H. G. *bar*, Engl. "bear." But even without comparative philology it has been seen that *fer-o* must be connected with *fer-io* and *fendo*; thus Müller supports his reading, *diffensus*, in Festus, p. 272 (*Suppl. Annot.* p. 401, above, p. 207), by referring to the use of *offendo*, *defendo*, *infensus*, *infestus*, *confestim*, "quibus illud ostenditur synonymum fuisse *feriendo* et *trudendo*," and he adds, "quod posteriorum temporum usu diceretur: *eam ob caussam dies differetur*: majore cum vi, nec sine emphasi quadam sic pronunciabatur: EO DIES DIFFENSUS ESTO." But if *diffendo=differo*, of course *fendo=fero*. With regard to the adjectives *infensus* and *infestus*, which are so often confused, while *offensus*, from *offendo*, shows that the former is connected with *in-fendo*, a comparison of *mani-festus*, *fest-ino*, proves that *in-festus* is the old and genuine participle of *in-fero*. The

meaning of these apparently synonymous words is quite in accordance with this etymology; for while *infensus* denotes an unfriendly or angry disposition of the mind, and so corresponds to *iratus*, *inimicus*, on the other hand, *infestus* always signifies some outward opposition or attack, so that it answers to *adversus*, *hostilis*. Hence we find in the same passage of Livy (II. 6): "concitat calcaribus equum, atque in ipsum *infestus* consulem dirigit .... adeoque *infensis* animis concurrerunt, ut .... duabus hærentes hastis moribundi ex equis lapsi sint," where the "*infensis* animis" implies the *animosity* with which they were actuated; and the *infestus* the direct charge full tilt against the adversary; as in the parallel description of the fight between the two brothers in Sophocles (*Antig.* 145) they are described not only as στυγεροί, but also as καθ' αὑτοῖν δικρατεῖς λόγχας στήσαντε. If we admit the affinity of *ferio* and *fero*, we shall see at once that the former, which is the secondary form, merely exhibits the adjunct *ya*, and the idea of striking is intimately connected with that of lifting, bearing, carrying; for a blow is nothing more than a weight or momentum brought to bear on some object: hence, the earliest weapon of offence is naturally termed a ῥόπαλον from ῥέπω, just as the instrument of protection is called ὅπλον from ἕπω (*New Crat.* § 259). The connexion between *fendo* and *fero* is not so obvious. When we recollect the affinity between *hir*, *hri*, χείρ, ἀρ-πάζω, κάρπος, αἰρ-έω, and γέν-το, *hinthan*, *can-is*, "hand," "hound," χανδάνω, *pre-hendo* (*New Crat.* §§ 162, 281), we see at once the possibility of a community of origin in *fero* and *fendo*. And as we cannot explain the δ or *th* in either case as a mere adjunct to the root, we must not be led by the actual change of *r* into *n*, in some of these forms, to the conclusion that this change has taken place in *hendo* and *fendo*. As in the case of χα-ν-δά-νω, it is more in accordance with scientific reasoning to suppose that the *n* is here an *anusvára* or euphonic nasal; and the insertion of this sound would naturally introduce the medial *d* before *r*, as in ἀν-δ-ρός, *ven-d-re-di*, &c. But, as we have seen, the Latin *r* has a natural tendency to commutation with *d*. Consequently, its absorption or assimilation in *-hend-o*, *fend-o*, would follow as a matter of course. And thus *fer-o*, *fen-d-o*, and *fer-io*, establish their claim to be considered as members of the same *fer*-tile stock.

§ 10. *Defective Verbs.*

The epithet "defective" is applied to verbs with a very restricted signification. Properly speaking, all impersonal verbs are defective in the 1st and 2nd persons, and all neuter and deponent verbs are defective in voice, except when the former are defective in person. But it is customary to restrict the term defective to those verbs which are specially incomplete in the machinery of their conjugation. Some of these are really only irregular appendages of existing verbs. Thus *cœpi* is the usual perfect of *in-cipio*, *memini* of *reminiscor*; *ausim* and *faxim* are obsolete tenses of *audeo* and *facio*, and the former of these, with *gaudeo*, *fido*, and *soleo*, has no perfect of the active form; *quæso*, *quæsumus* are the original articulations of *quæro*, *quærimus*; *forem* and *fore* are used with *sum* and *fui*. Some few verbs are employed in a sort of interjectional sense in the imperative only, as *apage*, *cedo*, &c.; others, as *vale*, which are thus used, appear also as regular verbs. *Odi*, "I hate," "I have conceived a dislike," is the intransitive perfect of a lost deponent, corresponding to the Greek ὀδύσσομαι (cf. ὄλωλα from ὄλλυμαι, &c.); this deponent form exists in the compound participles *exosus* and *perosus*. We can have no difficulty in understanding the parenthetical use which gradually reduced the oldest verbs of "speaking," *aio*, *inquam*, and *fari*, to a few of their commonest inflexions. We have the same result in the Greek ἦ δ' ὅς, and in our "quoth," which, as has been remarked above (p. 112), exists as an independent verb only in the compound "be-queath," and which contains the same root as *in-quam*. The forms of the imperfect and future (*in-quiebam*, *in-quies*), and the diphthong in the derivative *quæ-ro* = *quai-sino*, show that the root *in-quam* must have contained something more than a mere vowel of articulation, and that it was probably strengthened by the semi-vowel *i*. It therefore stands on a different footing from *sum*, the only other verb which retains the first person-ending in the present; for here the *ŭ* is a mere *sh'va* like that in *Hercŭles* (above, p. 266): cf. *as-mi* and ἐσ-μί. In the by-form *in-fit* we have *f* = *qv*, which is not uncommon.

CHAPTER XIII.

DERIVATION AND COMPOSITION.

§ 1. A. Derivation. General principles. § 2. Derivation is merely extended, or ulterior inflexion. § 3. (I.) Derivative nouns. § 4. (*a*) Forms with the first pronominal element only. § 5. (*b*) Forms with the second pronominal element only. § 6. (*c*) Forms with the third pronominal element only. § 7. (*α*) Terminations compounded of the first and other pronominal elements. § 8. (*β*) Terminations compounded of the second and other pronominal elements. § 9. (*γ*) The third pronominal element compounded with others and reduplicated. § 10. (II.) Derived verbs. § 11. B. Discrimination of compound words. § 12. Classification of Latin compounds.

§ 1. A. *Derivation. General principles.*

THE term derivation was once used to denote the process of guess-work by which the etymology of a word was ascertained, and it was formerly thought that the most satisfactory derivation of a Latin word was that which consisted in its direct deduction from some Greek word of similar sound[1]. The student of scientific or comparative philology does not need to be told that, although the Greek and Latin languages have a common element, or are traceable, in part at least, to a common source, their mutual relationship is collateral, and not in the direct line of descent, and that in these and other old languages of the Indo-Germanic family "derivation is, strictly speaking, inapplicable, farther than as pointing out the manner in which certain constant syllables, belonging to the pronominal or formative element of inflected languages, may be prefixed or subjoined to a given form for the expression of some secondary or dependent relation" (*New Crat.* Pref. 1st Ed.). According to this view, derivation includes a department of what is called word-building (*Wort-bildung*), so far as this is distinguished from mere inflexion. The modifications of the noun and verb, by which inflected language is characterised, belong indifferently to all forms, whether primary or derived, whether simple or compound. And after considering these formations, the grammarian naturally passes on to an investigation

[1] Döderlein is perhaps the last representative of this school, and some of his derivations (e. g. *fraus* from ψεῦδος!) are equal to the worst attempts of his predecessors.

of the cognate but subsequent procedure by virtue of which, (1) an existing noun or verb developes itself into a secondary form of the same kind, or (2) two or more distinct words are combined in one, and furnished with a single set of inflexions. This procedure is called word-building, and might be designated as *derivation* in reference to the materials, and *composition* in reference to the machinery. Practically, however, we confine the term *derivation* to the former department; namely, to the developement of secondary words containing only a simple root; while *composition* is used to denote the subordination of two or more crude forms under the influence of some set of formative appendages and inflexions.

§ 2. *Derivation is merely extended or ulterior inflexion.*

In considering the distinction between derivation and inflexion, we must bear in mind, that the former process is really nothing more than an extension of the latter. In forming a word, in the first instance, by the addition of cases or person-endings, we derive our formative materials from the same limited and classified stock of pronominal elements, which furnishes us with the machinery of derivation. Indeed, the new crude form, which becomes the vehicle of the inflexion, is very often neither more nor less than the oblique case of some existing word, and it is probable that this process has been repeated in successive derivations. This remark applies only to derivative nouns, for the new forms of verbs cannot rest upon the inflexions, i.e. person-endings, of their primitives. In general, we observe that there is much greater variety in the secondary formations of nouns than in those of verbs. For the person-endings of the latter anticipate the distinctive use of the three pronominal elements in their most prominent and important application, whereas the cases of the noun are connected only with a special developement of the second element, signifying proximity, and transition of agency or the point of motion, and of the third, denoting position and distance. In the derivative forms we find the converse phenomenon: for while the verbs are contented with extensions of their crude form, by pronominal additions limited to that special developement of the second and third elements, which is found in the cases of the noun, and which does not exhibit any direct reference to the primary distinctions of position; in the nouns all three prono-

minal elements are used, in their distinctive senses and in combination with one another, to form nominal derivatives, which may be extended by successive accretions to a considerable length of after-growth. A verb in the finite moods must always be distinguished by person-endings, which cannot become the vehicle of ulterior formations; and, for the same reason, all pronominal elements, which might be mistaken for person-endings by retaining the original distinctions, are excluded, in the verb, from the function of extending the crude form, which they exercise in the derivative nouns, both when they are and when they are not identical with the case-affixes of the primitive words.

§ 3. (I.) *Derived Nouns.*

It is not always possible to assign a definite meaning to all the elements or combinations of elements, which contribute to the extension of the crude form in Latin nouns; but so far as we can arrive at the signification of the affix, we can see that the distinctive use of the pronouns is preserved in this application; namely, that the *first* pronominal element expresses that the thing proceeds from, or immediately belongs to, the *subject;* the *second,* that it has a *relation to the subject;* the *third,* that it is a mere *object,* or something removed from the proximity of the subject. We also observe that the combinations of these elements are regulated by the same principle as that which explains their use in prepositions and other independent words; namely, "that if any one of the elements of position is combined with *-ra,* an ultimate form of the third element, it indicates motion and continuation in a direction of which the element in question represents the point nearest to the subject; and that by subjoining any one of the pronominal elements to any other of them, we denote a motion or continuation from the position signified by the first element towards that indicated by the second, and so on, if the combination involves more than two." (*New Crat.* § 169).

§ 4. (a) *Forms with the first Pronominal Element only.*

There are comparatively few Latin nouns in *-ma* or *-mus,* which express an action as immediately proceeding from the subject: such are *fa-ma,* "a speaking" (root *fa-*), *flam-ma,* "a burning" (root *flag-*), *tra-ma,* "a drawing" (root *trah-*),

ani-mus, "a blowing," *ar-mus*, "a joining," *re-mus* (root *ret-* or *rot-*) "a turning round" (in the water), i. e. "a rowing thing," *al-mus*, "a nourisher," *pri-mus*, "the first of a series beginning with the subject," &c.

§ 5. (b) *Forms with the second Pronominal Element only.*

The second element, under one or other of its various modifications, contributes most largely to the formation of derivative nouns. A great number of these are abstract or qualitative terms, and they differ from those in *-ma* and *-mus* by their more general and relative predication. For all those formed by the first element only may be translated as expressing the subject of action, and some of them, as *re-mus*, *al-mus*, cannot be regarded as mere abstractions. Whereas the nouns, which exhibit the second element as their termination, always depart from the idea of a subject or agent, and express only an agency or quality, like the English words in *-ness*, *-hood*, *-y*, &c. Sometimes the second element appears under a guttural form, as in *vo-c-s* (*vox*), "a voice" or "speaking" (Sanscr. *hvé*, cf. *βοή*, *ἠ-χή*, &c.); and to this class belongs the copious list of adjectives in *-cus*, *-ī-cus*, *ac-s* (=*ax*), &c., denoting quality or disposition, as *civi-cus* from *civis*, *amī-cus* from *amo*, *loqu-a-x* from *loquor*, &c. But by far the most common form of the second element, in its use as an affix, is that in which the guttural is vocalized to *i*. Besides the numerous words in *-ia*, *-ius*, *-ea*, *-eus*, *-ium*, *-is*, as *grat-ia* from *grat-us*, *mod-ius* from *mod-us*, *pic-ea* from *pix*, *calc-eus* from *calc-s*, *consil-ium* from *consul*, *febr-is* from *ferv-eo*, *nubes=nube-is* from *nubo*, *materies=mater-ia-is* from *mater*, &c., it seems reasonable to infer that the masculine nouns in *a*, together with some feminines, involve vocalized gutturals; for we cannot otherwise account for the formation of such words as *scrib-ă*, *notă*, *agri-col-ă*, &c., as compared with the Greek *κριτής*, *τιμή*, *συκέα*, and *ταμίας*, than by supposing an omission of the extenuated *i=y*: thus *scrib-a=scrib-yas* will be legitimately formed from *scribo*, *nota=not-ya=no-tia*, will properly correspond to *τιμή*, &c. in Greek, and to *amici-tia*, &c. in Latin. We may also compare *ad-vena=ad-ven-ya-s* with *ad-venio*. That such an extenuation is possible is shown by the transference of *ζώνη*, &c. into *zonă*, &c. (above, p. 295). We have also seen that the affix *i* lies more or less hid in some nouns of the third declension,

and especially in participles and adjectives (above, p. 301). This is particularly the case with the forms in *nt-s* or *nti-s*, and we may compare the affix *-tis* or *-tus*, in *pes-tis*, "a destroying," *ves-tis*, "a covering," *po-tus*, "a drinking," *spiri-tus*, "a breathing," with the Greek nouns in *-σις*, *-τις*, and *-τύς*, as *πρᾶκ-σις*, "a doing"=*πρακ-τύς*, *φά-τις*, "a speaking," &c. To the same class we must refer the participial adjectives in *-dus*, as *cupi-dus=cupient-s*, *candi-dus=candens*, &c. (*New Crat.* § 265). The nouns in which the termination **F***a* assumes the form *v*, are much less numerous in Latin than in Greek. We have, however, the following: *al-vus*, *ar-vum*, *cal-vus*, *cer-vus*, *ci-vis*, *cla-vis*, *cla-vus*, *cor-vus*, *cur-vus*, *eq-vus*, *fla-vus*, *ful-vus*, *fur-vus*, *gna-vus*, *lae-vus*, *ner-vus*, *par-vus*, *pra-vus*, *sæ-vus*, *sal-vus*, *ser-vus*, *tor-vus*, *vul-va*. If we compare *cer-vus*, *cla-vis*, *cur-vus*, *gna-vus*, *læ-vus*, with the Greek *κέ-ρα-*F*ος*, *κλῆF-ις*, *γῦρ-*F*ος*, *γενναῖος*, *λαῖος*, we shall see that the *v* in the former cases corresponds to a digamma in the terminations of the latter; *ner-vus* and *par-vus* compared with *νεῦρον* and *παῦρος* suggest the possibility of a metathesis in the latter analogous to that in *ἐλαύνω* for *ἐλα-νύω*; *ci-vis* compared with the Oscan *ce-us* brings us back to the root *κε* (above, p. 125); *tor-vus* contains the same root as *τορ-ός*, *ταρ-βεῖν*, *ταῦρ-ος*, *trux*, *trucido*, *tru-cu-lentus*, and we must assign *ă-trox* to the same class, the initial being one of those prefixes, which we find in *ἀ-νήρ*, *ἀ-στήρ*, &c.; and *eq-vus* compared with the Sanscrit *aç-va* refers us to the root *âç-u*, "swift," Greek *ὠκύς*, Latin *acer*. All the words in *-vus*, which have been mentioned, join this termination immediately to the root; but in some few, to which incidental allusion has been made above (pp. 146, 195), the *v* immediately follows an *r*; thus from the roots *ac-* and *cat-*, both signifying "sharp," we have the derivatives *ac-er-vus*, *cat-er-va* denoting a pointed, pyramidal heap, or a crowd following its leaders. Similarly, we have *Min-er-va*, from the root *min-*, "to think," and in the Arvalian chant we find *lu-er-ve*[*m*] for *luem*. In these instances we may suppose that the affix *-v-* is attached to a lengthened crude form, just as *hones-tas*, *onus-tus*, *tempes-tas*, *venus-tas*, involve something more than the mere root of the word, and there need be no doubt that the *r* in the cases just cited is merely the usual substitute for an original *s*. The termination *-vus* is also appended to certain adjectives derived from and

expressing the verbal abstraction; thus we have *ac-ti-vus* from the supine *ac-tum* (*ac-te*Fos), by the side of *ac-tio*, *na-ti-vus* from *na-tum* (*na-te*Fos), by the side of *na-tio*, &c.; and we know that the verb-forms in *-se*, *-tum* are the same in effect with the abstract nouns in *-sis*, *-tis*, *-τύς*=*τε*Fος, &c. (*New Crat.* §§ 254, 410 (3)).

§ 6. (c) *Forms with the third Pronominal Element only.*

The most common forms, under which the third element appears as an affix, are *t-* and *n-*. The former must be carefully distinguished from the participial ending in *-dus*, and those nouns in *-tus*, *-tûs*, which, as has just been mentioned, belong to a formation connected with the second pronominal element: the latter must be identified with the endings in *l* and *r* including the diminutives in *-lus*, *-leus* (*New Crat.* § 266). For the original identity between *t* and *n* it may be sufficient to refer to such forms as *re-ple-tus* compared with *ple-nus*, *cas-tus* compared with *câ-nus*, &c. The simple use of the third element, under the forms *t* or *n* occasionally softened into *s*=*r*, is confined to those neuter nouns which express a mere object, as *capu-t*, *cor-pu-s*; or to those nouns and participles which express a thing done, or the passive result of an action, as *digi-tus*, "that which is pointed," compared with *dignus*, "that which is shown," *liber-tus*, "he who is freed," compared with *dô-num*, "that which is given," *lec-tus*, "that which is gathered" (of leaves and the like), compared with *lig-num*, "that which is bound" (of a faggot), and the forms in *-nus* and *-tus* mentioned above; to which may be added *fa-num* compared with *fa-tum*, and *reg-num*, *pug-na*, *pen-na*, *pœ-na*, *va-nus* and *pa-nis*, compared with *rec-tum*, *cris-ta*, *lacer-ta*, *vi-ta*, *sagit-ta*, &c. The identity of the affixes *-tum* and *-num* with *-rum* and *-lum* may be seen by comparing *βέλο-ς*=*βέλο-τ*, "a thing cast or thrown" (*jac-tum*), with *jacu-lum*, *do-num* with *δῶ-ρον*, *sac-rum* with *ἀγ-νόν*, and *tem-p-lum* with *τέμε-νος*, whether as *τέμενος αἰθέρος* (Æsch. *Pers.* 357), or as the portion of land *cut* off and set apart for divine uses.

§ 7. (*a*) *Terminations compounded of the first and other Pronominal Elements.*

Many nouns exhibit in their affix a combination of the first element with the third, under the form *m*+*n*, which is often

strengthened by a repetition of the objective affix under the form *t*, so that the whole affix is *m*+*nt*. Of nouns in *-mŏn* corresponding to the Greek nouns in *-μων*, we have only three, *ser-mŏ*[*n*], *pul-mŏ*[*n*], *te-mŏ*[*n*], which may be compared with *γνω-μών*, *πλεύ-μων*, &c.; we have also a limited number of nouns in *-mnus*, corresponding to the Greek passive participle in *-μενος*, such as *auctu-mnus*, *da-mnum*, *vertu-mnus*, *alu-mnus*, *colu-mna*, *æru-mna*, &c. A comparison of *alu-mnus*, "the person nourished," with *al-mus*, "the nourisher," shows that the combination *m*+*n* completes the agency and carries it on to the object acted on. As in Greek we have *-μονη*=*-μο-ν-ια* by the side of *-μων*, so in Latin we find an extended termination *-mōnia*, in such words as *acri-mōn-ia*, *ægri-mōn-ia*, *ali-mōn-ia*, *cere-mōn-ia*, *casti-mōn-ia*, *parsi-mōn-ia*, *sancti-mōn-ia*, all of which express a quality or abstraction inferred from an act done. The force of these words is best shown by a comparison between these and the nouns in *m*+*nt*, which have a repetition of the third element instead of an addition of the second. These words, which agree with the Greek neuters in *-ματ*=*-μεντ*, either omit the final *t*, as in *car-men*, *cri-men*, *legu-men*, *stra-men* (above, p. 299), or, which is more common, exhibit the lengthened form *-mentum*, as in *ali-mentum*, *ar-mentum*, *arma-mentum*, *aug-mentum*, *orna-mentum*, *pul-mentum*. Now all these words express an action proceeding from the subject (*m*), but become objective (*n*), and exhibited in its results (*t*). Thus *car-men*[*t*] $=\pi o\iota\acute{\eta}\text{-}\begin{Bmatrix}\mu\alpha\tau\text{-}\\ \mu\epsilon\nu\tau\text{-}\end{Bmatrix}$ = Sanscrit *kar-man* means "a thing made," with especial reference to the maker. But *cere-monia*, which contains the same root (*cere-*, *cre-*, *kri-*), calls attention by its affix to the doing or process. Similarly, *al-mus* is "a nourisher," *alu-mnus*, "a person nourished," *ali-mentum*, "a thing for nourishing," but *ali-monia*, "the process of nourishing."

§ 8. (*β*) *Terminations compounded of the second and other Pronominal Elements.*

Of these combinations the most usual and important are the forms in which the second element, vocalized into *i*, is prefixed to the third element with or without further extensions. A very large class of nouns end in *-io*[*n*], and express, if one may say so, a fixed or consolidated abstraction. These nouns, which are

always of verbal origin when the noun is feminine, are formed either by affixing *-io*[*n*] to the simple stem, as in *leg-io, opin-io, reg-io, rellig-io,* and this is always the form in the masculine nouns, as *cur-io, centur-io, scip-io,* &c.: or by adopting the *t=s* of the supine, as in *man-sio, ses-sio, con-fu-sio, quæs-tio, col-lec-tio, dis-trac-tio, dubita-tio, pulsa-tio, con-jura-tio, positio, ad-moni-tio, erudi-tio,* &c. The masculine nouns generally denote a person or thing belonging to that from which the noun is derived; thus *cur-io*[*n*] is the man of the *cur-ia, centur-io*[*n*] the man of the *centur-ia,* &c. And as the genitive ended originally in *-iŏn=-siŏn,* we must consider these nouns in *-iōn=ion-s* as extensions of the genitive case. The same explanation will apply to the nouns in *-ō*[*n*], as *epul-ō*[*n*] from *epul-a;* for there is reason to believe (above, p. 295) that these forms have lost or absorbed an *i.* As the termination *-ia, -is, -sis, -tis* is particularly appropriated to verbal nouns expressing the action of the verb, we must conclude that the verbal nouns in *-io, -sio, -tio,* are also derived from the genitive of nouns in *-ia, -sis,* &c. And this will lead us to the meaning already suggested, namely, that these words denote the result of an abstraction which has become fixed and objective.

The important word *relligio* will furnish a good exemplification of my meaning. There have been two different opinions with regard to the etymology of this word. For while most modern scholars adopt the suggestion of Servius (*ad Virg. Æn.* VIII. 349), Lactantius (IV. 28), and Augustin (*Retract.* I. 13), namely, that the word comes from *religare,* supporting this view with the quotation from Lucretius (I. 931, IV. 7): "relligionum *nodis* animos exsolvere;" Cicero makes *religere* the main verb, and gives the following explanation (*de Nat. Deor.* II. 28. fin.): "qui omnia, quæ ad cultum deorum pertinerent, diligenter retractarent et tamquam *relegerent,* sunt dicti *religiosi* ex *relegendo,* ut elegantes ex eligendo, tanquam a diligendo, diligentes, ex intelligendo, intelligentes: his enim in verbis omnibus vis *legendi* eadem, quæ in *religioso;*" and similarly, in another part of the same work, he says (ibid. II. 3, § 8): "relligio est quæ superioris cujusdam naturæ (quam divinam vocant) *curam* cærimoniamque affert." This etymology is in accordance with the verse quoted by Aul. Gell. IV. 9: "*religentem* esse oportet, *relligiosum* nefas." And there can be no doubt that it is perfectly

true. It is clear from the use of the word that *relligio* is not derived from *religare*, "to bind back," but from *religere*, "to gather over and over again," "to think perpetually and carefully on the same subject," "to dwell with anxious thought on some idea or recollection:" so that *re-ligens* is nearly a synonym of *di-ligens*, and an opposite of *neg-ligens*. The word expressing the abstraction of the verb should end in *-ia*, but this, as in most of these words in *-io*[*n*], is lost, and we have only the derivation from the genitive case expressing the result of the abstraction—the realized ideal. Hence, practically, *relligio* signifies, (1) "religious worship," considered as scrupulous obedience to the exactions of the conscience, and with especial reference to the act of worship; as (Cic. *Verr.* II. 4, § 49): "qui sacris anniversariis ac summa religione coleretur;" or to the religious sanctity of an object; as (id. ibid. § 46): "fanum est Junonis antiquum, quod tanta religione semper fuit, ut semper inviolatum sanctumque fuerit;" (2) "religious scruple" or "superstitious fear," considered as something objective and real; as (Cæs. *Bell. Civ.* III. 72, § 4): "non recordabantur quam parvulæ sæpe causæ vel falsæ suspicionis vel terroris repentini vel *objectæ relligionis* magna detrimenta intulissent;" and especially in the plural, as (Lucret. I. 109): "*relligionibus* atque mineis obsistere vatum;" (3) by substituting the cause for the effect, "guilt causing religious scruple or fear," and "the divine curse and consequent remorse or oppression of the conscience caused by a sense of violated religious scruples." In the second and third sense it is used in a curious connexion with *violare* and *expiare* in three passages of Cicero, which have never, so far as I know, been compared by any lexicographer or commentator: (a) *ad Atticum*, I. 17, § 16: "quare et illa, quæ *violata*, *expiabuntur;* et hæc nostra, quæ sunt *sanctissime* conservata, suam *religionem* obtinebunt." Here, it should seem, *religio* means "scrupulous observance;" and the maintenance of uninterrupted intimacy between Cicero and Atticus is opposed to the atonement necessary to restore the violated harmony between Quintus and his brother-in-law. (b) *Tusc. Disput.* I. 12, § 27: "id quum multis aliis rebus, tum e pontificio jure et cæremoniis sepulcrorum intelligi licet; quas maximis ingeniis prædiți nec tantâ curâ coluissent nec *violatas* tam *inexpiabili religione sanxissent*, nisi hæsisset in eorum mentibus mortem non interitum esse omnia

tollentem atque delentem." It is clear from the collocation in this passage, compared with that of the former, that *religio* means not only the scrupulous observance of religious obligations, but the lasting curse or remorse, which, as a punishment, waits on those who violate the sanctity of divine worship. This feeling may, as the former passage shows, be expiated, atoned, or removed by the performance of suitable rites, or the guilt may be so heinous that no reconciliation can take place between the offender and his conscience; and thus we find—in the third passage to which I have adverted, (c) *Philipp.* I. 6, § 13: "an me censetis, P. C., decreturum fuisse, ut parentalia cum supplicationibus miscerentur, ut *inexpiabiles religiones* in rempublicam inducerentur?"—that a state would be involved in an ἄγος, or pollution, which no καθαρμοὶ could wash away, if funereal sacrifices in honour of the departed were mixed up and confused with public thanksgivings to the immortal gods.

From all this it appears that the formation in *-o* [*n*] brings the mere abstract noun, from which it is derived, into a more concrete reference, so that the meaning is rather the result of the verb's action than the action itself. This is the signification also of Greek nouns in *-ων, -ωνος*, many of which, as λειμών, denote some object or thing. The most important, and perhaps the least understood of these Greek nouns is αἰών, which denotes not only an unlimited extension in time, which is one meaning of ἀεί, but also present existence, or existence for the time being, as in ὁ κρατῶν ἀεί, "whoever happens to be in power" (Æsch. *Prom.* 973); thus αἰὼν may signify not only an age or eternity, but also the present life, as opposed to the future, which is sometimes its meaning in the New Testament, and the existing generation of a family for the time being, as opposed to the series of γενεαί, which make up the whole succession or continuance of a race (see the note on the *Antig.* 580, p. 179).

From *religio* we have the adjective *religiōsus;* and the occurrence of the same form in derivatives from nouns in *-ia* as *ærumn-osas* from *ærumna, glori-osus* from *gloria, luxuri-osus* from *luxuria,* &c., tends to confirm the supposition that the noun in *-io* is an extension of the noun in *-ia.* We find adjectives in *-osus* from other crude forms, as *dol-osus, libidin-osus,* and we may conclude that in these cases also the intermediate form is the genitive in *-ion.* The forms in *-tivus,* mentioned above

(p. 404), show that the origin of the abstract nouns in *-is, -sis, -tis*, &c., may be traced back to the supine in *-tum* and the infinitive in *-se* (cf. *New Crat.* § 410, (3)).

That in all the nouns in *-o*[*n*] the *i* of the genitive *-ion* is absorbed, may be proved by an examination of the abstract nouns in *-or*, such as *amor, favor, honor*, &c. For no one will doubt that the Latin comparative ending *-ior=ion-s* is equivalent to the Greek *-ιων=ιον-ς*. Now the termination *-or* is inexplicable except as an abbreviation of *-ior*. Therefore, *pari ratione, -on* must be an abbreviation of *-ion*. It is obvious that this view accords exactly with the meaning of such a noun as *amor*, which, as we shall see, results from a consonant verb *amo=emo*, and leads to the vowel-verb *amo=amao*. And thus *amor=am-io-n-s* means the act of choosing and selecting. Similarly, *favor=fav-ion-s*, which leads to the verb *fav-eo*, must have come from the root *φα*F-, and, like *fe-lix, faus-tus*, it conveys the ideas of light and happiness. The noun *hon-or* cannot be referred to any primary verb in Latin, but it is not at all difficult to discover its Indo-Germanic affinities. It may be referred at once to the Sanscrit root *van*, "to love and serve," Greek Fον-, in *ὀν-ίνημι*, &c., German *win* (*winnan*, Graff, I. 875). It thus denotes any kind of gain or profit, and the estimation of others, however expressed, is conveyed in the meaning of the abstract *honor*. Another form, indicating the concrete result, is *onus=onu-t*, and with all their differences of application *hones-tus* and *onus-tus* fall back to a common origin. This will not surprise any one who knows that the Hebrew כָּבֵד not only bears every signification of *honour* and *dignity*, but also denotes *weight*, with all its subordinate ideas of *difficulty* and trouble. We therefore see that as *favor* implies *light* and *cheerfulness*, as elements of happiness, *honor* expresses some more solid and weighty adjuncts of prosperity—*ἀδύνατον γὰρ ἢ οὐ ῥᾴδιον τὰ καλὰ πράττειν ἀχορήγητον ὄντα* (Arist. *Eth. Nic.* I. 9, 15). Or if we prefer to connect it with the idea of estimation, we may remember that *τι-μή* signifies merely putting a price upon something, and that *æs-timo* denotes a valuation by the standard of weight (above, p. 262). And thus the Romans would reckon personal distinction by weight (*honor*), by space filling the eye (*amplus*), and by the voice of fame occupying the ear (*clarus, gloria, κλέος*, &c.).

As the nouns in *-tio*[*n*] must be regarded as formed from the genitive of the abstract substantives in *-tis*=*tevs*, we may conclude from the similar signification of nouns in *-ta*[*t*]*s* and *-tu*[*t*]*s*, that they are formations from the ablatives of the same sort of nouns, and as *pinguêdo*=*pinguêd-in-s* is an extension of a noun formed from the ablative of *pinguis*, we may infer that nouns like *forti-tu-do* are similarly formed from nouns like *vir-tus*=*vir-tu-*[*t*]*s*=*vir-tud-s*.

As nouns in *-tis*, &c., denote the action, so we find that, with the affix *r*, the same termination implies the agent. Thus, besides some abbreviated forms in which the *t* appears unaffected by any addition to distinguish it from the third pronominal element, as *pa-ter*, *magis-ter*, *minis-ter*, but which the Greek forms in *-τηρ*, as *πα-τήρ*, show to have belonged to the same class with the abstract nouns in *-tis*=*-tyas*, we have a large class of words in *-tor*, fem. *-tr-ix*, denoting the agent. Thus, from *præ-ire*, "to go before," we have *prætor*=*præ-i-tor*, "one who goes before," i. e. "a general" or "leader," and from this again is formed *præ-tura*, denoting his agency, function, or office, and *præ-torium*, the place which is appropriated to him. The verbal nature of these adjuncts is shown by the fact that they are intimately connected with certain participial forms. Thus, from *scribo*, we have the supine or infinitive *scrip-tum*, "to write," and the participle *scrip-turus*, "about to write," as well as the nouns *scrip-tor*, "a writer," and *scriptura*, "a writing." And if we compare these with the participle (E. III.) *scrip-tus*, "written," we shall see the difference between the forms under discussion and those which involve merely the dental affix of the third pronominal element. For the latter imply only an object—a thing done—while those before us denote that the agent is still at work, and refer to the act of doing. Extenuated forms, like *magis-tĕr*, &c., are sometimes lengthened in their derivatives, as *magis-tērium*, &c., which revive the original type. But very often the *r* is immediately appended to the *t* in the neuter derivatives, so that we seem to have nothing more than the combination which appears in the third numeral, the comparative suffix, and the preposition *trans* (above, p. 328). But the analogy of the other endings and the meaning of the words plead for the connexion of the objective nouns in *-trum* with the words denoting agency, and thus bring

these nouns to an agreement with the longer extensions in *-terium* and *-torium*. Writers on Latin etymology, who have not fully studied the subject, or are deficient in the tact which verbal criticism presumes and requires, have been in the habit of explaining nouns in *-trum* as denoting always the instrument or means of doing; and one of these incompetent philologists has actually ventured on the absurdity of proposing (*Proc. of Philol. Soc.* II. p. 249) that as *movere castra, ponere castra* are common phrases, the *castra* must have been the axes which the soldiers carried with them for the purpose of felling trees to fence their encampment! To say nothing of the fact that *cas-trum* and *cas-tellum* both occur in the singular to denote an inclosed place of security, and that they may be explained with reference to the root of *casa*, "a house," *cas-tus*, "religiously pure and protected from external contact," κάσ-τωρ, "a mailed warrior," &c. (*New Crat.* § 267)[1], it is not the fact that "the suffix *-trum* denotes always the instrument." If, which is nearly certain, it is only a weaker form of *-terium* or *-torium*, we should infer from this analogy that all these nouns denote a thing, whether place or object, considered with reference to a certain agency. We cannot always trace these secondary words to a noun signifying an agent, or to a verb from which such a noun might be derived: but it is clear in every case that this is the involved or implied meaning. The following are all the nouns in *trum: an-trum*, "a place for going up" (cf. βάρα-θρον with ἄν-τρον, and, for the root, Fανά, *ven-io*, &c.); *ara-trum*, "a thing for ploughing" (cf. *ara-tor*); *cas-trum*, "a place for enclosing" (κάζω); *claus-trum*, "a thing for shutting" (*claud-o*); *fere-trum*, "a thing for carrying" (*fer-o*); *fulge-trum*, "a thing for flashing" (i.q. *fulgur*); *haus-trum*, "a thing for drawing" (*haur-io*); *mulc-trum*, "a thing for milking" (*mulg-eo*); *ras-trum*, "a thing for scraping" (*rad-o*); *ros-trum*, "a thing for gnawing or cutting" (*rod-o*, cf. *se-curis*, גֵּרְזֵן, &c., above, p. 75); *ru-trum*, "a thing for digging" (*ruo*); *trans-trum*, "a thing for crossing" (*transeo*); *vera-trum*, "a thing for purifying" (*vero*, "to make *verus*, i. e. *purus*"); *vere-trum*, "a thing for causing shame" (αἰδοῖον). We should erro-

[1] Farther analogies are suggested by the various uses of סָכַךְ; cf. σαγ-ή, and σάκ-ος.

neously assign to this class *astr-um*, *apiastr-um*, *cent-rum*, *flag-rum*, &c., which are nouns in *-um* or *-rum;* but we occasionally find a genuine noun in *-trum* strengthened by *-s*, which is merely functional, as in the Greek forms κελευ-σ-τής from κελεύ-ω, &c. Such are *capi-s-trum*, "a thing for catching" (*capio*); *lu-s-trum*, "a thing for purifying" (*lavo*); *mon-s-trum*, "a thing for pointing at" (*manus*, μην-ύω). To this class I would refer *plau-s-trum*, which some have attempted to derive from *plaudo*, as *claus-trum* comes from *claudo*. It seems better to explain the word with reference to Virgil: "*tarda* Eleusinæ matris *volventia plaustra*" (*Georg.* I. 163), which alludes to the slow and heavy waggon with its solid wheels, as it is still found in Lombardy. In this way we shall revert to the Greek πολεύω, πόλευ-σ-τρον; the analogy is supported by κέλευστρα ἢ κέλευστα· ἅμαξα ἡμιονική (Hesych.); and the meaning by a passage, which, however, introduces some subordinate ideas; Soph. *Antig.* 340: ἰλλομένων ἀρότρων ἔτος εἰς ἔτος, ἱππείῳ γένει πολεύων. Whether the reference to the Eleusinian Ceres is or is not to be taken as an intimation that the *plaustrum* was of Greek origin, there can be no reason why, as in *theatrum*, *sceptrum*, *sistrum*, &c., a Greek name should not have been naturalized in this instance. In general, then, we may say that nouns in *-trum* indicate the thing with reference to the doer, and so denote the means or opportunity of doing, whether considered as a place or as an instrument.

The same is the signification of another set or rather double set of words in *b-r*, *b-l*, *c-r*, *c-l;* thus we have *voluta-brum*, "a place for rolling," *vena-bulum*, "a thing for hunting," *sepul-crum*, "a place for burying," *vehi-culum*, "a thing for carrying;" and by the side of these we have nouns of agency in *s*, as *volu-cris*, "the flyer," &c. When we compare *li-ber* with ἐλευ-θερός, *ru-ber* with ἐρυ-θρός, *u-ber* with οὖ-θαρ, &c., we see that these words, according to the principle of divergent articulations (above, p. 6), must find their common origin in some forms combining θ, as the representative of the sibilants, and through them of the gutturals, with some labial, just as *fera*, φήρ, and θήρ presume the Russian *svehrs;* now this combination is neither more nor less than the F- which represents the second pronominal element; but the nouns of agency in *-ter* give us this second element in its dental degeneration, followed by the same *r* as a

representative of the third element; therefore, the endings $b+\left\{\begin{matrix}r\\l\end{matrix}\right\}$, $c+\left\{\begin{matrix}r\\l\end{matrix}\right\}$ must be divergent representatives of the same original $\mathsf{F}+r=\mathsf{F}+n$, to which in point of fact they come quite as near as $t+r$ (above, p. 355).

The same analysis may be applied to the nouns in *-e-tum, -i-le,* and *-a-rium,* as *arbor-ê-tum, ov-î-le, gran-â-rium;* for if *arbor-eus* is formed by an adjunct of the second element under the form *ya, arbor-ê-tum* must extend the same form by an addition of the third element, and a similar explanation will be required by the long $\hat{\imath}=ii$ and $\hat{a}=ea$ of *ov-î-le* and *gran-â-rium,* to which the *l* and *r* terminations are appended.

We see then that all nouns expressing agency, or the place, means, and occasion of agency, are formed by adding a combination of the second and third pronominal elements—and this is what we should *à priori* expect—for the idea of agency is that something, i. e. a doing, proceeds from the subject, who by the nature of the case is presumed to be near, and passes on to an object, which by the nature of the case is presumed to be relatively more distant. But we observe that the same sort of endings are used to form ordinary adjectives derived from nouns and not from verbs; thus from *rex* we have *reg-ā-lis = reg-ya-lis,* from *Roma* we have *Rom-ānus = Roma-yă-nus,* from *consul* we have *consul-ā-ris = consul-ya-ris,* from *civis* we have *civī-lis = civi-ya-lis,* from *asinus* we have *asin-ī-nus = asin-ya-nus,* &c., which fully correspond to the forms *ov-ī-le, gran-â-rium,* &c.; and there is also a class of diminutives in *-cu-lus,* which exhibit the same termination as the verbal nouns *veh-iculum,* &c.

It will be easy to show that the combination of elements in these cases is as consistent with their primitive signification as in the class previously examined. To begin with the diminutives. As there are objective nouns in *-tum, -lum, -rum,* as well as nouns combining this affix with one belonging to the second element, so there are diminutives in *-lus* and *-leus,* as well as those exhibiting the compound termination now under consideration. Thus we have *libel-lus = liber-u-lus, filio-lus,* &c., as well as *pisc-i-culus, homun-culus,* &c. The origin of the diminutive expression, or ὑποκόρισμα, is to be sought in the tendency to speak of a darling object, as, at the same time, little. Whether this has or has not any connexion with a

mother's fondness for a child is doubtful. But it is a universal practice to speak of a petted object as a *glycerium*, γλυκέριον, or "dear little thing." In classical Latin the diminutive *puella* =*pueru-la* is invariably used instead of the original word. Now in these terms the feeling of personality becomes evanescent, and that of mere objectivity takes its place. With a view to the expression of this idea it seems to be a matter of indifference whether we merely append the objective ending *-lus*, Greek *-ν*, or connect this with the main verb by some possessive affix derived from the second element—in Latin *-c*, Greek *-ι*. For example, we may form the secondary noun *juven-cus* from *juvenis* without any change of meaning; and *pul-lus*, *catu-lus*, &c., will be just as good diminutives as *juven-cu-lus*. The other derivatives, mentioned above, must be regarded as extensions of the case in *-i-na* or *i-n* (p. 276). Thus *Român-us*=*Roma-in-us* is a man who lives "at Rome," *Roma-i*[*n*]. This is shown still farther by the relation between these nouns and their extensions in *-en-sis*. These derivatives are either formed directly from their primitives, as *praten-sis*, "that which belongs to or grows in the meadow" (*prato-en*=*prat-in*, in a heavier form *prat-en*), or else they involve some noun already formed upon the locative, as *Roman-ien-sis* from *Romanus*. "In genere," says Ruhnken (*ad Suet. Cæsar.* § 37, p. 58), "adjectiva, quæ in *-ensis* exeunt, designant res hominesque, qui sunt in aliqua regione, sed aliunde originem habent. *Romanus*, qui Romæ natus est; *Roman*[*i*]*ensis*, qui Romæ degit: *Siculus*, qui in Sicilia ortus est; *Siciliensis* qui incolit Siciliam, aliunde ortus: v. Fest. *v. Corinthiensis* et Intt. ad Vellei. Paterc. II. 51. Idem discrimen apud Græcos in Ἰταλὸς et Ἰταλιώτης, Σικελὸς et Σικελιώτης, &c.: v. Ammonium in his vocibus et ibi Cl. Valckenar." This is a correct statement of the fact, but it does not explain the formation of the secondary nouns in *-ensis*. As Ἰταλιώτης, &c., are formed from nouns in *-ια* (*New Crat.* § 259), so we always find that, if there are co-existing derivatives in *-nus* and *-en-sis*, there is an intervening form in *-ia*. Thus from *Hispanus* we have *Hispania*, and from this again *Hispaniensis* as from the locative *Hispania-in*. Accordingly, we may infer that *Romaniensis*, which is the true form, comes from an intervening *Romania* as the country of the *Romani*. The permanence of this rule of secondary derivation is shown by the practice of our bishops,

who call themselves *Cantuariensis, Dunelmensis,* &c., to show that they are temporary incumbents, rather than hereditary peers.

A comparison of these nouns with the equivalent Greek forms in *-ιω-τηϛ, -ιή-τηϛ, -ι-τηϛ*, teaches us that the termination *-sis*, attached to the locative *-en* and belonging to the second element, is identical with the similarly derived *-τηϛ*. We shall therefore not be surprised to find it also under the forms *-tis* and *-ter*. This is the fact when the locative, to which it is attached, is plural, as in the case of those nouns, which express an extended region rather than a definite locality. As we say, *in agris, in campis, in sylvis, in terris,* rather than *in agro, in campo,* &c., it is natural that we should find, as we do, *agrestis, campes-ter, sylves-ter, terres-ter,* rather than *agren-sis,* &c., which do not occur. At first sight we might feel disposed to refer *eques-ter* and *pedes-ter,* rather to the substantives *eques, pedes,* than to the locatives *equis, pedibus.* But the omission of *b* in *queis* for *quibus,* &c., shows us how *pedeis* might be a locative, and we have a passage in Virgil, which actually places the locative *equis* on a parallel footing with the derived *pedes*= *ped-it-s ; Æneid.* VII. 624 :

> Pars *pedes* [i.e. *pedibus* iens] ire parat campis: pars arduus altis
> Pulverulentus *equis* furit: omnes arma requirunt.

The noun *seques-ter* does not belong to this class. As denoting a functionary, it connects itself at once with *magis-ter* and *minis-ter,* and as these involve adverbs, which are of the nature of locatives, we must derive *seques-ter,* not from *sequor* with the old grammarians (for then we ought to have *secu-tor*), but from *secus*=*sequis* (cf. *sequior*)=*ἕκαϛ*, and thus *sequester,* which means a mediator, umpire, or other indifferent party, will naturally imply one who stands apart from both the litigants; for *quod secus est* is opposed to *quod interest* (Plautus, *Trin.* I. 2, 93).

The patronymics in *-ilius* must not be referred to the same class with the nouns in *-ile, -inus, -arius,* &c. As it is known that in this case *li*=*di* (compare *Acilius, Epilius, Hostilius, Petilius, Pompilius, Popilius, Venilius,* with their original forms *Acidius, Epidius, Hostidius, Petidius, Pompedius,* Umbr. *Pumpeřius, Popidius, Venidius*), we must refer these words to the same class with the Greek patronymics in *-δηϛ*, where the second pronominal element appears under the form of an approximate dental sibilant (*New Crat.* § 262).

§ 9. (γ) *The third Pronominal Element compounded with others and reduplicated.*

The most common extension of the third pronominal element is its reduplication under the forms *t+n*, or *n+t*, the latter combination being by far the most usual. With regard to other forms into which the pronoun enters under the type *t*, it is not always easy to say whether this is a corruption of *ty*, or merely the expression of the objective word. Thus we have seen that in *t+r* there is something more than the third element extended by the addition of *r*. It is probable, however, that in such affixes as *-ti-mus* and *-ti-nus* we have merely the third element in the first syllable; compare the Sanscrit *punya-ta-mas*, *hya-ta-nas* and *nú-tnas*, in which the dental appears unaffected by any foreign element, with *ex-ti-mus*, *legi-ti-mus*, *cras-ti-nus*, *hes-te-r-nus*; and *taci-tu-r-nus* with the passive participle *taci-tus*. We come to a similar conclusion by comparing the older spelling of the affix, as in *op-tumus*, with the change in τύπτ-ο-μεν = τύπτ-ο-μες, *volu-mus*, *dic-i-mus*, whence it appears that the *u* is not a vocalized consonant, but a mere change of articulation for an original *o = a*. In this inversion, it really matters very little, so far as the meaning of the affix is concerned, whether the dental syllable is referred to the second element or the third. This has been shown in the analysis of the third numeral, which admits of a similar explanation, whether we consider it as made up of *ta+ra*, or regard it as a corruption of an original *tva-ra* (*New Crat.* § 157). Be this as it may, there can be no doubt that the combination *n + t*, which plays so important a part in Latin derivatives, is a reduplicated form of the third pronominal element, expressing objectivity in its vaguest signification. Hence we find this combination (resolved into *ă*[1]) as the neuter plural of all nouns; and either unresolved, or in various forms of assimilation, in the third person plural of verbs, in the active participles, and as a further affix to nouns corresponding in meaning and often in origin to the perfect passive participle of the Greek verb and to obsolete Latin participles. In all these usages it denotes collective or vague

[1] A curious collateral proof of this resolution is furnished by Φλιάσιος for Φλιούσιος=Φλιούντιος from Φλιοῦ[ντ]ς: vide Steph. Byz. *s. v.*; and from this we may see that διπλάσιος is of participial origin.

objectivity—in the neuter plural, a heap or mass of objects (like the Hebrew אֵת, *Maskil le-Sopher*, p. 14); in the third person plural, an action performed by an indefinite number regarded as an aggregate; in the participles, a mere notion of doing or being done. In the present instance we are concerned only with the participial forms and the nouns connected with them; and here we find in Latin not only forms in *-nt*, as *aman[t]s*, or in *m* + *n* or *m* + *nt*, as *car-men*, *ver-tu-mnus*, *car-men[t]s*, but also elongations of both in *-ntu-s*, *-ndu-s*, and *-mentu-s*. Thus we have *qua-ntus* by the side of πᾰ̂[ντ]-ς, *ama-ndus* by the side of *ama-n[t]s*, and the names of places, which, in Greek end in *-εντ-ς* = *-εις*, *-οντ-ς* = *-ους*, or *-αντς* = *-ας*, generally appear in Latin under the form *-entum*; thus *Acragas*, *Crumoeis*, *Maloeis*, *Pyxus*, *Taras*, become *Agrigentum*, *Grumentum*, *Maleventum*, *Buxentum*, *Tarentum*. Similarly, we have *ar-mentum*, *orna-mentum*, &c., by the side of *σω̃-μα*[τ] = *σώ-μεντ*, &c. These extensions have occasioned some difficulties in Latin etymology; it will be sufficient here to take the two interesting examples supplied by *fundus* and *pondus*. The former is obviously, on the principle just mentioned, an extension of *fun[t]s* or *fon[t]s*, the participle of *fuo*, "to pour out," which is involved in the agglutinate form *fu-n-do* (cf. *per-do*, *cre-do*, &c.), and in the frequentative *fu-to*. The nouns *fon[t]s*, "a fountain," i. e. "that which pours forth water," and *fundus*, properly "the bottom of a vessel for pouring out," hence the lowest part or basis of any thing, the solid part or foundation of a man's property, his estate or τὸ ὕπαρχον, exhibit the formation under discussion, without any additional elements. But *pondus*, gen. *ponder-is*, leads us to the same class of words as *opus*, *operis*, and these, as we have seen (above, p. 299), are terminated by the softened dental, as an additional mark of objectivity. The ablative *pondo*, however, shows that there must have been a word *pondus*, *pondi*, corresponding to *fundus*, *fundi*, and the synonymous ablative *sponte*, "by the weight or inclination," proves that the participial noun *pons*, *pontis* (in old Latin abbreviated into *pos*, Varro, *L. L.* V. I. p. 3, Müller) originally referred to a weight laid down, or poured forth, such, for example, as an embankment, a mass of earthwork, or separate stones thrown into the water (γέ-φυρα), which was the primary notion of a bridge, as the means of crossing a stream: for we need not go far to prove the antiquity of stepping-

stones. While we have the *d* in *pendo, pendeo*, &c., the *t* of *sponte* is retained in *ponti-fex*, as describing the functions of the priest, who settled the atonement for a specific fault by the imposition of a fine, on payment of which he pronounced the offender free from guilt, so that he stands opposed to the *carni-fex*, who exacted satisfaction on the body of the delinquent, without incurring the guilt or the danger of Shylock. We have a similar idea in the Hebrew פֶּרַע (see *Prælect. Phil. in Deborœ Canticum*, Cantabr. 1848, p. 10). The connexion of the root *fo* = *svo* = *hvo* = χϵϜ or χϜϵ with *po* or *spo*, is farther shown by the community of meaning between χῶμα and *pons*, between σπένδω and *fundo*. And we may also compare *fons* with *pontus*, which properly indicates the *depth* of the sea (whence ποντίζω, "to sink deep in the water,") and so corresponds to *fundus*, which is also predicated of the sea; cf. Virg. *Æn.* II. 419:

imo Nereus ciet æquora *fundo*

with III. 577:

fundoque exæstuat imo,

which is a metaphorical description of the eruption.

§ 10. (II.) *Derived Verbs.*

After what has been said on the subject of the conjugations, the derivative forms of verbs will not involve a lengthened discussion. We have seen that, in addition to the second pronominal element under the form *i=ya*, which appears in the contracted verbs and in so many other derivatives, we have two varieties of consonantal addition, *-n* and *-sc*, which increase the verb-lists by many important predications. These have been discussed in their proper places, as examples of the different conjugations. But although all these verbs are derivatives, there are some of them which may be considered as specially or doubly deserving of this title; namely, as derivatives from derivates. Thus we have a large class of frequentatives in *ĭ-t*[*a*]*o*, shortened sometimes into *-t*[*a*]*o*, which must, upon a strict analysis, be regarded as derived from nouns which may have been themselves derived from verbs. We see this at once in *milit-*[*a*]*o*, "to play the soldier," from *miles*, crude form *milit-*. For *miles* is derived, like *pedes*, &c., from a word compounded with *i-t-*, from *i-re* (above, p. 264); so that *milito* really involves a derivative from *eo*. In the same way, *interpret*[*a*]*or*

comes from *interpre[t]s*, a word, which, like *pretium*, involves the preposition *per* and the verb *i-*, "to go;" so that *pretium* means "that which changes hands" (cf. *πέρ-νημι*, *πρ-ᾶσις*, *πρ-ίαμαι*, &c.), and *inter-pr-i-t-s* is "one who goes between two parties in making a bargain, or serves as the medium of communication in any way" (cf. *paries*, *New Crat.* § 178). Although we have not the intervening noun in all or most of the other frequentatives, we may infer that it once existed, from these and other instances, because, as we have seen, any verb may have a noun of agency in *-t-s* or *t+r* formed from it. Accordingly, if *milito* comes from *miles*, and *interpretor* from *interpres*, *ag-ito* and its compound *cōg-ito* = *co-agito*, must presume a noun *ages* = *ag-its*. As we have seen, the affix *-t-s*, denoting agency, may be represented by *-dus;* thus we have *rap-i-dus=rap-i-ens=rap-tor; cup-i-dus=cup-i-ens*, &c. Now we have *pav-i-dus=pav-ens* by the side of *pav-i-to;* and from this and other examples we may conclude that the iteratives in *-to* are derived from nouns of agency in *-t-s* or *-dus*, whether this noun of agency is intermediately formed from the root *i-*, "to go," as in the case of *mil-i-t-s*, *mil-i-to*, or is directly derived from some other verb, as in the case of *pav-e-o*, *pav-i-dus*, *pav-i-to*. The verbs in *-ĕ-r[a]o* have also a frequentative meaning, as may be seen from *i-ter[a]o*, "to go over and over again," which has furnished a name for the class just discussed. But it is not necessary to consider these verbs in *-e-r[a]o* as derived from other verbs, except so far as the nouns from which they spring are of verbal extraction. They are all built on the foundation of nouns in *s=r*, and perhaps they always presume that this letter represents an original dental, so that the noun is as regularly neuter as the noun which leads to the frequentative in *-t[a]o* is regularly masculine. Thus *iter-o* comes from *iter; agger-o* comes from *agger; temper-o* comes from *tempus*, *tempor-is; oner-o* comes from *onus*, *oner-is*, &c. When we cannot find a corresponding noun under this neuter form, we may infer it from collateral considerations. Thus *moder-o*, compared with *medit-or*, *μελε-τάω*, &c., suggests an objective word corresponding to *μέλος*, as a correlative to the noun of agency *modus*. Then, again, *toler-o*, which has no corresponding noun, leads us naturally to a form analogous to *τέλο-ς*, *dolu-s*, and signifying "a thing taken up," or "a load;" cf. *onus* and *onero* with *se-dulo*. We are confirmed in the

belief that these verbs in *-ro* come from objective forms in *r=s*, by the fact that we have also derivatives from the nouns of agency, which affix this letter to the *t=d* mentioned above; thus we find such verbs as *pene-tro* of the first conjugation, the termination of the future participle, which is originally identical with that of the nouns of agency in *-tor* (above, pp. 360, 365), being here shortened, as in *minis-ter* by the side of *præ-tor;* and *pene-tro*, compared with *peni-tus*, shows how this affix is related to the form of the second element which appears in *t+r;* for *cæli-tus=οὐρανό-θεν*, &c. We have the same derivative forms, strengthened by the subjunctive or optative *i*, in the desiderative verbs, which seem to be deduced immediately from the future participle; thus, from *scrip-tor* or *scrip-tur-us*, we have *scrip-tur-io;* from *peti-tor* or *peti-tur-us*, we have *peti-tur-io;* from *esurus = ed-turus*, we have *e-sur-io*, &c. The variation in quantity between the desiderative verb and the noun or participle, with which it is so intimately connected, may be explained by the lengthened form of the verb, and illustrated by *minis-tr-i* compared with *minis-ter-ium*, &c. In some of the desiderative verbs the unorganic *t* is absorbed or assimilated, as in the supines or infinitives, like *ven-um*, *molta-um*, &c. (above, p. 360). Thus, from *scat-eo* we have *scat-urio*, from *lingo*, *ligurio*, &c. It is scarcely necessary to observe after what has been said, that the verbs of the first conjugation in *-ico* must be referred to adjectives in *-icus*, whether they still exist or are only contained in these verbs: thus, *alb-i-co* presumes an *alb-icus* as well as *albus;* compare *ἀλφός* with *λευκός*, &c. The same remark applies to the verbs in *-ulo*, which must have proceeded from nouns in *-ulus;* compare *modulo* with *modulus*, &c. In speaking of derivative verbs we must bear in mind that, although a verb may furnish the basis of a series of derivative nouns, it may still have some parent stock among the older names of things. For example, although *rog-atio*, *preca-tio*, &c., are derivatives from *rogo*, *precor*, the fact that these verbs belong to the *a* conjugation shows that they are themselves derived from some primitive noun like *p-rec-es*. The following tables will help the student to determine when, in a given case, the substantive is formed from the verb, or *vice versâ*. In general he will see that this depends on the appearance of a derivative pronominal adjunct in either case.

I. NOUNS DERIVED FROM VERBS.

Nouns in E = A-I are derived from consonant-verbs.

facere	*faci-es*
fidere	*fid-es*
con-spicere . . .	*speci-es*

Nouns in U or SU from TU (compare *ven-um* with *fal-sum* and *moni-tum*) are derived from consonant-verbs.

currere . . .	*currus=cur-sus*
discedere . . .	*discessus*
gradi (*aggredĕre*, &c.) .	*gradus*
ludere	*lusus=lud-sus*
vertere	*versus*

Consonant-nouns are derived from consonant-verbs.

ducere	*dux*
legere	*lex*
munus capere . .	*muni-ceps*
pa-n-gere . . .	*pax*
regere	*rex*

Here the final *-s* of the noun must involve the syllable *-us* in the last-mentioned class.

II. VERBS DERIVED FROM NOUNS.

Verbs in A=*aya*[1] are derived (*a*) from nouns in A=*ya*.

curare	*cura*
fugare	*fuga*
morari	*mora*
prædari	*præda*

(*b*) from nouns in I, in a causative sense.

celebrare	*celebris*
ditare	*ditis*
gravare	*gravis*
levare	*levis*

[1] The fact that the *a-* verb really includes the element $i=ya$ is conclusively shown by the form *nego* – *neg-*[*a*]*o* = *nec-aio*, "I say no" (above, p. 98).

Here the I of the crude form coalesces with the A, as in *funalis* for *funi-alis, navalis* for *navi-alis,* &c.

A noun of the I declension occasionally forms a verb in A without any absorption of the I; thus we have *ab-brevi-are* from *brevis,* and *al-levi-are,* as well as *levare,* from *levis.*

(*c*) from nouns in O.

bellare	*bellum*
donare	*donum*
numerare . . .	*numerus*
populare . . .	*populus*
probare . . .	*probus*
regnare . . .	*regnum*
sanare	*sanus*

(*d*) from consonant-nouns.

fraudare . . .	*fraus*
generare . . .	*genus*
laborare . . .	*labor*
laudare . . .	*laus*
nominare . . .	*nomen*
onerare . . .	*onus*
orare	*os*
vocare	*vox*

This is particularly the case in compounds, as in *belligerare* from *belliger,* which is formed from *bellum* and *gerere.* And we must not overlook the fact, that nouns in A=*ya* are formed in the same manner from consonant-verbs, not only in compounds, like *agri-cola, homi-cida,* &c., from *colere, cædo,* &c., but also in simple forms, as *ala,* "that which raises," from *alere; lingua,* "that which licks," from *lingu-ere; toga,* "that which covers," from *tegere,* &c.; so that we may always assume an intervening *a-* noun.

Verbs in E are generally secondary extensions of simple roots. Some, like *lucere,* are derived from consonant-nouns. Not a few, like *ardere, favere, fulgere, pavere,* coexist with nouns in *-or=yor.* The same, however, may be remarked of verbs in A; compare *amare* by the side of *amor=am-yor,* or *ama-yon-s.* For *in-dulg-eo* we must go back to an assumed *dulgus,* cf. the Greek δολιχός, ἐν-δελεχής, &c. (above, p. 76). And *fœteo* must be derived from *fœ-dus* (originally *fœtus,* "by-

gone=stale," cf. *ef-fœ-tus*), which signifies "nasty," referring, in the first instance, to the smell, and, by a natural transition, to whatever is disagreeable: thus we speak of "a nasty accident," &c.

Verbs in I are derived from nouns of the I declension. Thus we have

audire	*auris=auDis*
finire	*finis*
lenire	*lenis*
mollire	*mollis*
vestire	*vestis*

When we seem to have an exception to this rule, we can always find, on looking into the question, that the crude form of the noun, from which the verb in *i* is derived, does involve this letter. Thus we have *sepire* from *sepe*, which is really an *i* noun; *punire* is from *pœna*, but the Greek ποινή=ποι-νυ-α, and the adjective *impuni-s*, show that the form ends in *i*; *moliri* comes from *moles = mole-is*; *sortiri* from *sors=sor-ti-s*, gen. pl. *sorti-um*; and *blandiri* is referred to *blandus*, which is really the participle of *bl*[*a*]*o=fl*[*a*]*o*, "to breathe or blow gently" (cf. μαλα-κός, μαλ-θα-κός, &c.); such phrases as *blandus prece* vel *hostia*, "soothing with prayer," or "sacrifice" (Hor. *Ep.* XI. 1, 135. *Carm.* III. 23, 18), whence we have *blandæ preces* (id. *Carm.* IV. 1, 8. *A. P.* 395), still retain the participial meaning; and this is presumed in the adverb *blanditer* (Plaut. *Asin.* I. 3, 69), so that the true form is *blan-ti-s*, whence *bland-i-ri*.

Verbs in U, when this amounts to *u-ya*, are derived from nouns in U. Thus we have

acuere	*acu*
metuere	*metus*
tribuere	*tribus*

This may be regarded as a singular case; for no contraction is possible in a derivative verb of this kind.

§ 11. B. *Composition. Discrimination of Compound Words.*

The proper distinction between a compound word and the apparently compounded form consists in the fact, that the former is an union of two or more words, of which the last only is inflected, so that the preceding crude forms remain in a construct or subordinate state, whereas the mere juxta-position, or

apparently compounded term, is made up of separable elements, the inflexions of which are retained. Thus in such words as *magnanimus, ædifico,* we have entirely new compounds; for the former is an adjective made up from the ablative of quality, so that *magnanimus = is qui magno animo est;* and the latter is a derivative from a compound adjective *ædificus,* which involves the whole predication *ædem facio.* On the other hand, the composition is only apparent in *res-publica,* "the commonwealth," *jus-jurandum,* "an oath," *juris-peritus,* "a lawyer," *animadverto = animum adverto,* "to pay attention to," "to take strict notice of," "to punish," &c. That these are not compounds, but merely juxta-positions of separable elements, is clear from the fact that, in those which are in direct agreement, both parts may be inflected throughout, as *rei-publicæ, jure-jurando,* and all may be separated by particles, as in *res vero publica, juris legumque peritus.* There is no doubt, however, that these parathetic structures may pass into regular compounds, in the course of long usage. Thus from the phrase *sesque* for *as semisque,* "one and a half," we have the compound *sesquipes,* "a foot and a half," and its derivative adjective *sesquipedalis.* Again, when the first part of a real compound is an indeclinable word, it may be separated by a *tmesis* from the inflected part of the compound; thus we have *inque salutatus* for *insalutatusque,* and *per mihi mirum videtur* for *permirum.* In such forms as *nihilo-minus, dum-taxat, ut-pote, vide-sis, sodes=si-audes, scilicet,* &c., the two words are merely written in continuity to show their hasty utterance in the flow of conversation. Sometimes it requires a careful analysis to prove that the word is really a compound. Thus *annus* or *anus* seems at first sight to be necessarily a simple word; but it is proved by philological dissection (p. 163) to be a shortened form of *ἀει-νός = ἀεὶ νεόμενος* (cf. *οὐρα-νός* and *ὠκεα-νός,* according to the old notion of a *wide* superincumbent firmament, and a *swift* stream flowing round the earth), and the idea attached to the word is that which is expressed in Virgil's lines (*Georg.* II. 401):

Redit agricolis labor actus *in orbem,*
Atque *in se* sua per vestigia *volvitur annus.*

Then again it is an etymological discovery that *præs, custos, opu-lentus, vio-lentus,* &c., are not merely derivative forms, but real compounds (above, pp. 298, 393); and the same remark

applies to the verbals in *-bilis* and *-bundus*, which involve the verb of becoming (*fio*), and are not to be explained, like the derivatives in *-bulum*, as *vena-bulum*, by a mere reference to the pronominal formations.

§ 12. *Classification of Latin Compounds.*

If we consider the Latin language only, we may conveniently distribute all the compound words into four classes.

(*a*) *Determinative* compounds are when the first part of the word defines the second; such are the prepositional compounds: *cognomen, dedecus, interrex, semideus, injuria, nefas, consul, collega, pronepos*, &c., where the prefix qualifies the meaning of the whole word. In some cases the meaning is defined by an involved epithet, as in: *cav-œdium, lati-clavis, lati-fundium, quatri-duum*, &c.

(*b*) *Syntactical* compounds are when the first word is governed by the second, whether the regimen is that of a noun dependent on another noun, as in *galli-cinium*, "the crowing of a cock," *opu-lentus*, "loaded with wealth," *stilli-cidium*, "a falling of drops;" or, what is much more common, that of an accusative case governed by a verb, as in: *agri-cola=qui agrum colit, brevi-loquens=breviter loquens, male-dicus = qui maledicit, signi-fer = qui signum fert;* and in the verbs derived from such compounds, whether the intervening noun is still extant or not; as: *œqui-paro = œquum paro, castigo=castum ago, purgo = purum ago*, &c. To the same class belongs *aurīgo* from *aurīga* or *aureax = qui aureas agit*, according to Festus (p. 8): "*aureax*, auriga. *Aureas* enim dicebant frenum quod ad aures equorum religabatur; *oreas* quo ora coercebantur" (cf. pp. 27, 4, 182, 23). If this interpretation is not sufficient, we must consider the *aures* or ἄντυγες of the chariot as referred to in the compound; for as this term is applied to the side-pieces of the plough, which Virgil terms a *currus*[1] (*Georg.* I. 174), it may have been also a designation for something corresponding to

[1] Modern editors read *cursus*, but it is difficult to see why *cursus* should be applicable to a plough, when the same word with an assimilation is considered inapplicable. It appears to me that the secondary word is more suitable to the metaphor than the direct verbal. Besides, it is clear from the verb *torqueo* that the plough itself, not its motion, is here alluded to in "currus a *tergo* torqueat *imos*."

these side-pieces in the wheeled vehicle. I may remark, in passing, that the *oriel* window, in Gothic architecture, was undoubtedly so called from its projecting like the human ear from the side of a building. The old spelling shows this. Thus we find in an ancient MS.: "The Lords always eat in Gothick Halls, at the high table or *oreille* (which is a little room at the upper end of the hall where stands a table,) with the folks at the side tables;" in accordance with which we find in Matthew of Paris (*ap. Ducang.* s. v.): "ut non in infirmaria, sed seorsim in *oriolo*, monachi infirmi carnem comederent." Now it is well known that *oreille* is a representative of *auriculus*. So that the *oriolum* or "oriel" is the "ear-window" or projecting chamber used for privacy and retirement.

(*c*) *Auxiliary* compounds are when two verbs come together, and the second helps the former either in a predication of time, or by introducing a modification of meaning or reference; thus we have: *ama-vi* = *amare-fui*, *ven-do*=*venum do*, *ven-eo* = *venum eo*, *arcesso* = *accedere sino*, *treme-facio* = *tremere facio*, &c.; and to the same class belong all the tenses in *-bam* and *-bo*, *-vi* and *-veram*.

(*d*) *Possessive* compounds are when the first part denotes the manner, in which the thing, denoted by the last word, is *possessed* by the subject, to which the whole compound is referred either as predicate or epithet; thus we have: *aheno-barbus*, *alti-sonus*, *crassi-pes*, *magn-animus*, in which the first part is a declinable word; and *affinis*, *concors*, *nefastus*, *beneficus*, *inermis*, *bimaris*, *elinguis*, in which the first part is an uninflected particle: in both cases the possessive adjective, constituted by the whole compound, involves a determinative compound, which is made moveable, so as to agree with different substantives. Among these nouns, we must take care to distinguish between those in *-ceps* from *caput*, as *bi-ceps*, gen. *bicipit-is*, and the syntactical compounds involving *-ceps* from *capio*, as *muni-cep-s*, gen. *muni-cip-is*, &c.

Although this classification of the compounds is sufficient for all practical purposes, so far as the Latin language alone is concerned[1], it is convenient, with a view to comparative philology,

---

[1] Livy remarks incidentally (XXVII. 11) that the Latin language was inferior to the Greek in the power of forming compound words.

to inquire how far these composite formations admit of arrangement in accordance with the system of the Sanscrit grammarians. As I have compared the six classes of the *samâsa* with the Greek compounds (*New Crat.* § 309), and as Bopp has subsequently adapted this arrangement to his more general purposes (*Vergl. Gramm.* pp. 1427, foll. VI. *Abtheil.* 1852), it may be as well to place the Latin formations under these heads. The six classes of the Sanscrit *samâsa* are designated by names some of which describe and others exemplify the nature of their construction; and they are arranged by *Vopadêva* in the following order: (1) The first are described by the term *dvandva*, i. e. "two and two," "pair," or "doubling," and consist of mere aggregations of words which might be written separately and joined by a copulative conjunction, as *agnî-çômâu*, "Agni and Soma," in the dual; *brâhmaṇa-kshatriya-viṭ-çûdras*, the four Indian castes, in the plural; &c.; (2) the second are exemplified and named by the compound *bahu-vrîhi*, "that which has much rice," and therefore consist of compound epithets; (3) the third are called *karma-dhâraya*, "that which comprehends (*dhârayati*) the object (*karma*)," and include such words as *mahâ-râjah*, "a great king," where a substantive is defined by an uninflected epithet prefixed; (4) the fourth, exemplified by *tat-purusha*, "the man of him," comprises compounds formed of two or more nouns, the first set being in some oblique case governed by the last, which may be a substantive, adjective, or participle in *-ta*, as *râja-purushah*, "the king's man;" (5) the fifth, called *dvigu* from *dvi*, "two," contains compounds of which the first part is a numeral and the second a noun, as *chatur-yuga-m*, "the four ages of the world;" (6) the last class is called *avyayî-bhava*, or "adverbial," and is made up of indeclinable words, the first part being some particle, and the last a noun in the neuter gender, as *a-sançaya-m*, "without doubt," *ati-mâtra-m*, "over the measure." It appears from this enumeration that classes (3) and (5) are *determinative*, class (4) is *syntactical*, class (2) is *possessive*, and class (1) is merely an aggregation of terms. The following examples will suffice, so far as the Latin language is concerned.

(1) There are no Latin *dvandva*, unless we recognise such a form in *su-ovi-taurilia* = *suile* + *ovile* + *taurile*. But the Latin language, especially in its oldest form, abounds in examples of

nouns aggregated together so as to form one notion, and without any copulative conjunction; thus we have *populus Romanus Quirites* for the united people of Romans and Sabines (Niebuhr, *H. R.* I. p. 294); *Patres Conscripti*, for the combination of two elements, the original and the elected deputies, in the senate; *sarta tecta* for *sarta et tecta*, "sound in wall and roof" (Festus, p. 322), &c. Notwithstanding this old Roman usage of combining related words by mere juxta-position, we find that in later times the language became pedantically accurate in the employment of copulative conjunctions; two epithets to the same word required the intervention of one of these particles; and the best writers made a consistent distinction between *et*=*ad*=ἔτι the particle of addition, *-que* the particle of combination and parallelism, and *at-que* (shortened into *ac*), which is compounded of the other two, and implies that there is not only an addition, but also an intimate connexion between the things coupled together.

(2) Of *bahu-vrîhi* compounds there is a long list in Latin. In addition to the possessives mentioned above, we have compounds made up of substantives and their epithets, as *versi-color*, *multi-caulis*, *acu-pedius;* of numerals and substantives, as *quadru-pes*, *bi-dens*, *quinque-folius;* of prepositions and substantives, as *com-modus*, *com-munis*, *ex-cors*, &c.; of verb-roots preceded by particles, as *male-dicus*, *bene-ficus*, &c. To this class belong the opposites, *pro-sper* or *pro-sperus*, "in accordance with our hopes" (Non. 171, 25: *sperem* veteres pro *spem* dicebant, unde et *prospere* dicimus, h. e. *pro-spe*) and *a-sper*, "contrary to our hopes" (i. e. *a spe*), as in Sallust, *Cat.* c. 26: "*aspera* fœdaque evenerant," compared with *Jug.* c. 63: "cuncta *prospera* eventura." It is more usual to compare *prosper* with πρόσφορος.

(3) *Karmadhâraya* compounds in Latin are such as *pæninsula*, *neg-otium*, *pro-nepos*, *ab-avus*, *in-imicus*, &c.

(4) We have *tat-purusha* compounds in Latin words like *tibī-cen*, for *tibii-cen*, *auri-fodina*, *opi-fex* for *operi-fex*, *lapicidina* for *lapidi-cidina*, *mus-cipula*, *imbri-citor*, &c.

(5) The Latin determinatives include many *dvigu* compounds as a subordinate class; such are *bi-noctuum*, *quinquertium*, *bi-ennium*, *quadri-vium*, &c.

(6) Adverbial compounds or *avyayî-bhava* are in fact cases

of nouns with or without epithets or prepositions; as: *obviam, affatim, admodum, multi-modis, imprimis,* &c. To this class we must refer the correlatives *se-dulo* = *se-dolo,* "without feeling any weariness," and *se-fraude,* "without incurring any loss." The epithet *malus,* technically applied to *dolus* in the old laws, proves that it does not of itself imply "deceit" or "guile" (see Festus, p. 69), and the verbs *dol*[*a*]*o,* "to belabour," *doleo,* "to labour," whence *dolor,* "labouring," show that the primary meaning of the word is "pain" as connected with exertion. The root is that of *tol-lo, tolero,* τλάω, ἄ-θλιος, &c., and Döderlein (*Syn. u. Et.* I. p. 118) has well compared *sedulo* with ἀ-πόνως = *haud gravate* in Soph. *Œd. C.* 293. In the same way, it may be shown that *frau*[*d*]*s*=*fra-va*[*d*]*s* (above, pp. 122, 298) signified deprivation as an effect, before it indicated dishonesty as the cause.

All these examples refer only to nouns, whether substantives or adjectives, and adverbs, considered as cases of nouns. Strictly speaking there are no synthetic or organic compounds of verbs; those, which have a preposition or adverb by way of prefix, are merely parathetic combinations, and, with the exception of an occasional assimilation, the two parts of the word are not really fused into one, and a *tmesis* or separation is still possible. When a verb contains two or more distinct roots, so melted down into one whole as to be incapable of divulsion, we also find that the verb is a derivation from some compound noun. Thus while *bene-facio, male-dico, com-pono, per-lego,* and the like, are shown by the unaltered conjugation of the verb to be mere juxta-positions of separable elements, *lœti-fic*[*a*]*o, belli-ger*[*a*]*o* are manifestly not merely parathetic combinations of *lœtum facio* and *bellum gero,* but verbs derived from the adjectives *lœti-ficus, belli-ger,* probably through a noun of action in *-a* = *ya.* As verbals in *-us,* like *beneficus, lœtificus, maledicus,* &c. are equivalent in meaning to the present participles of the parathetic verbs which they represent, and as their comparatives are actually formed from the participles (e. g. *maledicus, maledicentior*), we may conclude that the termination is the mutilated form of some pronominal affix, like that of the Greek participles in -ώς=*vas* or *vis* (*New Crat.* § 414).

When the first part of a genuine compound is an inflected word and the second begins with a consonant, the vowel of con-

nexion is generally *ĭ*, as in *causi-dicus, corni-ger, ædi-fico.* The vowel of connexion is sometimes omitted, as in *nau-fragus* for *navi-fragus, mus-cipula* for *muri-cipula, puer-pera* for *pueri-pera.* Sometimes a consonantal affix is also dropt, as in *homi-cida* for *homini-cida.* And in a few cases the connecting vowel is not *ĭ*, but *ŏ* or *ŭ;* thus we have *aheno-barbus, opulentus, turbu-lentus, Troju-gena, vio-lentus.* It is possible that the articulation may be affected here by the letters *n* and *j*, which precede, or by the liquid *l* which follows the vowel. In *tibīcen* = *tibi-i-cen* we have a contracted *i*, but *tubĭ-cen* follows the general rule.

CHAPTER XIV.

CONSTITUTION AND PATHOLOGY OF THE LATIN LANGUAGE.

§ 1. Genius of the Latin language. § 2. Abbreviations observable in the written forms. § 3. Ancient testimonies to the difference between the spoken and the written language. § 4. The poetry of the Augustan age does not represent the genuine Latin pronunciation; § 5. which is rather to be derived from an examination of the comic metres. § 6. The French language is the best modern representative of the spoken Latin. § 7. The modern Italian not equally so; and why. § 8. Different dialects of the French language. § 9. But all these dialects were closely related to the Latin. § 10. Leading distinctions between the Roman and Romance idioms. § 11. Importance and value of the Latin language.

§ 1. *Genius of the Latin Language.*

EVERY language may be considered as an organic body possessing within itself a principle of vitality, but also capable of disintegration and decay. We may therefore, without straining the metaphor, speak of its *constitution*, or power of continuing in a healthy state; and also of its *pathology*[1], or of the symptoms of that disease to which it is by its very nature more peculiarly liable.

Accordingly, if it were necessary to describe in one sentence the genius and constitution of the Latin language, one could not do this better than by defining it as a language which is always yearning after contraction. Whether this tendency is indicated in the written remains by the usual processes of synizesis, assimilation, and apocope; whether it appears in the slurring-over of syllables, by which the scansion of the comic metres is effected; or whether we perceive it in the systematic abbreviations which mark the transition from the Roman to the Ro-

---

[1] Lobeck, who has called one of his works *Pathologiæ Sermonis Græci Prolegomena*, gives the following explanation of this term as applied to language: "Cui nomen *Pathologiæ* imponere non nefas duxi, fretus auctoritate et exemplo Theodoreti, qui, similitudinem a re medica transferens, librorum suorum elegantissimos *παθημάτων Ἑλληνικῶν θεραπευτικὴν* inscripsit. Videlicet, vocabula quoque affectiones suas habent, non homines solum, et eas similes humanis,—pleonasmos, ellipses, tropasque varias, ad quas et cognoscendas *diagnosi* opus est et ad corrigendos *therapia;* nam et hoc nomen usu ceperunt grammatici" (*Præf.* pp. v. vi.).

mance languages, it is still one and the same,—it is the type of the language, in its infancy, its maturity, and its decay.

The most distinct and vivid picture of the Latin language is, therefore, to be derived from a consideration of this peculiarity, as developed—

I. In the written language of ancient Rome.

II. In the spoken language of ancient Rome, so far as we can discern it in the remains of the comedians.

III. In the modern languages (and particularly in the French) which are derived from the Latin.

§ 2. *Abbreviations observable in the written forms.*

I. With regard to the written forms in which the Latin language has been handed down to us, it would not, perhaps, be too large an assertion, if we said that every etymological difficulty arises more or less from this systematic abbreviation. It is true that all languages are more or less liable to this diminution of the forms of speech, and it is the more observable in proportion as the syntax militates against the permanence of the etymological structures. But the distinctive peculiarity of the Latin appears in the fact that this abridgment coexists with a perfect maintenance of the word-forms, as far as the inflexions are concerned, and does not spring from the superabundance of syntactical substitutes. It is in fact a result of the haste and impatience of the Roman lords of the world, and is quite independent of the inherent principles of the language. If we look to other idioms, we shall see that, although the Sanscrit *çlôka* runs the words into one another, and so affects the terminations, there is no appearance of abbreviation in the middle of the words. The Hebrew and other Semitic dialects have broken down all the formative machinery, but the triliteral root maintains its consonants, except where assimilation becomes inevitable. To the latest period of Hellenistic Greek the spoken and written language tolerated the syllabic articulation of the longest compounds. High-German still revels in the manufacture of polysyllables. And even the Sclavonic idioms, which have so many points of contact with the Latin, are not led, even by the concourse of consonants, to abridge their composite forms; and in the haste of polite conversation we may

hear the most sesquipedalian utterances at St Petersburg[1]. It is only the Latin language and its daughters, in which we observe this systematic shortening, first of spoken, and afterwards of written words, and therefore we may both attribute it to the habits of the people, and describe it as the characteristic feature of the Roman and Romance form of speech.

There are two ways in which this tendency manifests itself—in the loss of the termination, and in the coalition of syllables in the middle of the word.

When clipt or mutilated words are common in any language, the cause is to be sought in the strength and prominence of the single accent[2], which is generally thrown forward as far as possible, and in the impatience with which practical and busy men hurry through that part of their work which consists in talking. The rules of the Latin metrical system might have prepared us for something of the kind. It has been shown in a former chapter (above, p. 225), that the triple recurrence of the ictus was the essential feature of the Saturnian verse, the thesis being observed or neglected at the pleasure of the composer. Similarly, the accentuated syllable of a word, or that on which the emphasis of pronunciation was allowed to fall, was supposed to represent the significance of the term, just as the weight of a body is considered to be collected at its centre of gravity; and the other syllables were slurred over or cast aside as superfluous and unnecessary incumbrances. As instances of this, one might adduce a number of syncopised forms of common words. We have *ac* for *atque*, *amavere* for *amaverunt*, *amare* for *amaris*, *cœl* for *cœlo*, *do* for *domo*, *dein* for *deinde*, *gau* for *gaudio*, *nec* for *neque*, *neu* for *neve*, *ni* for *nisi*, *pa* for *parte*, *po* for *populo*, *seu* for *sive*[3], &c.; and, not to speak of the *visârgah*, by which a final *s*, though written, was not pronounced (*New Crat.* § 242), we have a number of words in which the termination *-is* or *-us* was re-

---

[1] E. g. the common Russian for "present my compliments to your father" is *zasvidyetel'stvuete moe pochtenie vashemu batyushkye* i. e. *testificaminor meam venerationem vestro patri*, where the conventional verb is as long as an Aristophanic compound.

[2] See Dietrich, *Zur Gesch. d. Accents im Lateinischen, Zeitschr. f. d. Vergl. Sprf.* I. pp. 543, sqq.

[3] See other instances in Columna's *Ennius*, p. 137.

gularly abridged to *-ĕ:* such as, *ille, ipse, mage,* &c., for *ollus, ipsus, magis,* &c. The contemptuous familiarity with which the master addressed his slaves gave rise to a number of abbreviations of the Greek names of the latter. Thus *Artemidorus* was called *Artemas* (Varro, *L. L.* VIII. § 21), *Epaphroditus* became the *Epaphras* of St. Paul, and *Demodorus* shrunk into *Demas* or *Dama* (Hor. II. *Serm.* 5, 101; ibid. 6, 54).

But the hasty pronunciation of the Romans, so far as it was exhibited in the written forms of the language, appears chiefly in the omission of letters or syllables in the middle of words. If the hurried talker has time to pronounce more than one syllable, he would rather preserve the termination than any of the middle sounds. Indeed, the accent sometimes stands over the ruins of a number of syllables, which it has fused into one compound articulation. The following instances, selected from a very large number, may serve to illustrate this: *Ala* for *Axilla* (Cic. *Orat.* c. 45, § 153), *aula* (*olla*) for *auxilla, brûma* (scil. *dies*), "the shortest day," from *brevimus, carcer* from *co-arceo, contaminare,* the derivative verb from *contagimen, contio* for *conventio, cunæ* for *cubinæ, dixti* for *dixisti, exilis* for *exigilis* (from *egeo,* cf. *exiguus*), *ĭmus* for *infimus, jusso* for *jussero, lapicidinæ* for *lapidicidinæ, mala* for *maxilla, mollis* for *mobilis, omentum* for *opimentum, otium* for *opitium, Pollius* for *Publilius* (Nieb. *H. R.* I. n. 977), *paullus* for *pauxillus, porcet* for *porro arcet* (Fest. s. v. *arceo,* p. 15, Müller), *prudens* for *providens, puella* for *puerula, qualus* for *quasillus, sacellum* for *sacraculum* (comp. *sakaraklúm Herekleís = sacellum Herculis,* in the *Cippus Abellanus,* l. 11), *solari* for *sublevari, stipendium* for *stipipendium, sublimis* for *sublevimis* (cf. μετέωρος), *subtilis,* "fine-spun," for *subtexilis* (comp. *subtemen, tela*), *summus* for *supremus, tandem* for *tamendem, vânus* for *vacanus, velum* for *vexillum,* &c. This is particularly remarkable in the flexion-forms of nouns and verbs; and, as we have seen above, the complete forms cannot be restored until we have made good the losses occasioned by this systematic abbreviation. Thus we have regularly *dici-er,* or even *dici,* for *dicerier;* and less commonly *sumpse* for *sumpsisse,* &c. In some cases this abbreviation will appear in a compound, though the full form is retained in the simple word. Thus, we find *agnĭtus* and *cognĭtus* by the side of *nōtus, pejĕro* and *dejĕro* by the side of *jūro,* and the same difference of quantity may be

effected without any change in the spelling, as in *nihĭlum* by the side of *hīlum*. This influence of the accent is the more felt in proportion to the length of the form; and sometimes we find two or three abbreviations in the same compound. For example, although the gen. *cujus* retains the original termination, this has been shortened into ĭ in the compound: *cuĭ-cuĭ-modi* for *cujus-cujus-modi* (Cic. *ad Att.* III. 22).

The Romans, however, were not satisfied with getting rapidly through their simple words and regular compounds. The same principle was applied to the parathetic formations: thus *magis auctus* was condensed into *mactus*[1], *magis volo* was written *malo*, *non volo* became *nolo*, and so forth; and not only so, but we also find that in the case of quasi-compounds, made up of two or more words, which are not amalgamated by the loss of inflexions into one whole, some part of the termination of the first word is regularly omitted, and thus the group is subjected to the domination of a single accent. It may be sufficient to mention such words as *audĭn* = *audisne*, *Ecere*, *Ecastor*, *Epol* = [per] *œdem Cereris*, *Castoris*, s. *Pollucis*[2], *ho'die* = *hoc die*, *meridie* = *medii die*, *multimodis* = *multis modis*, *nudiustertius* = *nunc dies tertius*, *omnimodis* = *omnibus modis*, *refert* = *rei-fert*, *sis* = *si vis*, *sodes* = *si audes*, *tectifractis* = *tectis fractis*,

---

[1] J. J. Scaliger says (*Scal. Pr.* p. 105): "*mactum* veteres Romani vocant auctum. Herbam adultam Cato vocavit *mactam*, nempe quod ita aucta esset. *Macta hostia* cum frugibus et mola aucta erat; sic macta ara, quod verbenis aucta et cumulata. Postea *mactare hostiam* pro *caedere* dicebant, ne scilicet caedem nominarent, quia nunquam cædebatur nisi frugibus *macta esset*. Nunquam autem *mactabant hostiam* quin dicerent 'macta esto hac mola salsa.' Sic cum Deo alicui vinum libabant *macte hoc vino esto* dicebant in vocandi casu, quod est τεχνικὸν grammaticorum, nam *mactus esto* dicendum erat. Sic Persius: stemmate quod Tusco ramum *millesime* ducis, pro millesimus." This passage seems to have been taken by the compiler of the *Scaligerana* from Scaliger's letter to Vertun, *Mus. Crit.* II. p. 47.

[2] It has been shown above (p. 257) that the dentals, when preceded and followed by vowels, are frequently omitted in the French forms of Latin words; and similarly, D and T must have been dropt in the old pronunciation of some Latin words, such as *pater*, *modo*, *quidem*. The words *Epol* and *Ecastor*, with *es* for *edis*, &c., exhibit the same fact in the written forms of the old Latin language, and therefore complete the induction.

vasargenteis = vasibus argenteis, &c. Then, again, we find a number of verbal juxta-positions, for we cannot term them compounds, belonging to the same class: such are *pate-facio = patere-facio, sci-licet = scire licet, vide-licet = videre-licet*, &c. It has been shown above, that many verbs in *-do, -eo, -lo, -so*, may be explained in the same manner; and that a similar analysis may be applied to the secondary tenses of every verb.

It is not necessary to pursue this part of the subject any farther; for we can scarcely read a page of Latin without finding some proofs of the general rule[1].

§ 3. *Ancient Testimonies to the difference between the spoken and the written Language.*

II. But although there is much abbreviation in the written forms of the Latin language, the orthography of the Romans expressed much more than their articulation. This is more conspicuous in proportion as we take a more polished and advanced period of the language. Before proceeding to demonstrate this from the metres of the comedians[2], it will be convenient to adduce some passages, in which the difference between the written and the spoken language of ancient Rome is expressly recognised.

When Cicero's Crassus (*de Oratore*, III. 11, § 41) is speaking of the true mode of pronouncing Latin, he says: "I

---

[1] The reader might be referred for further instances to a paper on the "Ausfall oder Verwandlung der Consonanten durch Zusammenziehung oder Assimilation in der Lateinischen Sprache," in the *Rheinisch. Museum* for 1839 (pp. 42—81); but, although most of the words there enumerated are cases of contraction, the author, Professor Schwenck, has not been happy in his restorations. In the same volume of the *Rhein. Mus.* p. 297, there is a criticism on Prof. Schwenck by Dr. Düntzer.

[2] The first attempt, so far as I know, to apply this very natural and obvious test of the old colloquial pronunciation of Latin, was made by Mr. Hallam in his *View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages*, Vol. III. p. 316, where he says: "a decisive proof in my opinion of the deviation which took place, through the rapidity of ordinary elocution, from the strict laws of enunciation, may be found in the metre of Terence. His verses, which are absolutely refractory to the common laws of prosody, may be readily scanned by the application of this principle." But perhaps every observing reader of the Latin dramatists, especially since the time of Bentley, may have arrived at some similar conclusion.

do not like the separate letters to be either pronounced with pedantic accuracy, or slurred over too carelessly." This shows that, though an uneducated countryman might represent by his articulation too little of the written word, it would be a fault, on the other hand, if the scholar recollected too much of his spelling. Again, Suetonius, who had seen the chirograph of Augustus (*Vit. Octav.* c. 87), writes thus about his method of spelling (c. 88): "He did not strictly attend to orthography,—that is, the method and laws of writing as taught by the grammarians;—on the contrary, he seems rather to adopt the opinion of those who think that we should write just as we talk. For as to his often changing or omitting not letters only, but whole syllables, this is a common inaccuracy; nor would I remark the fact, did it not appear strange to me that he should have superseded a consular legate as being illiterate, because he saw in his handwriting *ixi* for *ipsi*." From this it is clear, that in the time of Augustus people did not pronounce as they wrote. Quintilian, too, expressly tells us (*Inst. Orat.* XI. 3, § 33), that, "although it is necessary, on the one hand, to articulate every *word*, yet it is wearisome and disgusting to take account of every letter, and as it were to reckon them up: for not only is the crasis of vowels very common, but even some of the consonants are disguised when a vowel follows;" and then he quotes the examples of both *ecthlipsis* and *synalœpha* in Virgil's *multum ille et terris*. Much to the same effect are Cicero's remarks about the *conglutinatio verborum* or avoidance of the hiatus by a kind of *crasis* or *synizesis* (*Orator.* c. XXIII. § 78), and he says expressly that the Latin language repudiates a concurrence of vowels (*Orator.* c. XLIV. § 150: "quod quidem Latina lingua sic observat, nemo ut tam rusticus sit, qui vocales nolit conjungere"). From these and other passages which might be quoted, we conclude that the written language of Rome could not be taken as a standard of even the most exact and careful pronunciation of educated men living in the city itself, whose mode of pronouncing was strikingly different from that of the provincials (Cicero, *de Oratore*, III. 11, § 43, cf. *Brutus*, c. LXXIV. § 259)[1]. Accordingly, the colloquialisms of the country people must have

[1] On the difference between the *lingua urbana* and the *lingua rustica*, see Adelung, *Mithridat.* II. p. 464, and the works quoted by him (p. 467).

been still farther removed from the written language of the day, and are less to be inferred from it.

The true way of considering the Latin language, if we wish to realise to ourselves its spoken form, is to regard it as struggling with the fetters of the Greek metrical system.

§ 4. *The Poetry of the Augustan age does not represent the genuine Latin Pronunciation;*

The poetry of the Augustan age shows us, that the Greek rules of metre are observed with greater strictness by the Romans, who adopted them, than by the Greeks themselves. With the Roman poets the trochaic dipodia, that important rhythm in lyric poetry, always appears under the form of trochee + spondee; whereas in the Greek system there was nothing to prevent the dipodia from being pure. Take, for instance, the Sapphic verse: Horace's second foot is always a spondee, Sappho's as often a trochee. The same minute accuracy, or rather sameness, is observable in their *anacrusis*. In Horace's Alcaics the anacrusis at the beginning of the first three lines is rarely a short syllable; but in his Greek models he would as often find a short syllable as a long one[1]. All this

---

[1] The remarks in the text refer to a mode of scanning the Sapphic and Alcaic stanzas, which is not in accordance with the common doctrine, but which is, I think, demonstrably correct. The Sapphic and Alcaic stanzas differ only in a varied arrangement of the same elements; and the first three lines of the Alcaic stanza begin with an anacrusis, which the Sapphic rhythm excludes. If we call the dactyl A, the trochee B, and the anacrusis x, the law of the verse appears in the following simple formulæ:

(1) Sapphic stanza: $2\,B + A + 2\,B$ (*ter*)
$2\,A.$

(2) Alcaic stanza: $x + 2\,B + 2\,A$ (*bis*)
$x + 4\,B.$
$2\,A + 2\,B.$

Thus, for example, the Sapphic contains three lines like—*Jám sa|tís ter‖ris nivis ‖ átque | dírcæ ‖*, and one like—*térruit | úrbem ‖*; where, it will be observed, the second member of the trochaic as well as of the dactylic dipodia is always a spondee. The Alcaic has two lines like—*Vī|dēs ut | álta ‖ stēt nive | cándidum ‖*, one like—*Sŭl|vaē la|bóran‖tēs ge|lúque ‖*, and one like—*Flúmina | cónstite‖rínt a|cúto.* With regard to the Sapphic verse, in particular, it will not perhaps be easy to correct errors which are

leads to the inference, that the poetry of the Augustan age was recited with a pedantic accuracy at variance with the genius of the language; and as the German opera-singers at the present day soften down their gutturals in order to accommodate their language to the flowing rhythm of Italian music, so the Romans, in the days of Horace and Virgil, were proud of their foreign fetters, and were glad to display the ascendancy which vanquished Greece had gained over the minds of her rude conquerors.

§ 5. *which is rather to be derived from an Examination of the Comic Metres.*

This refined and mincing pronunciation was, of course, less compatible with the colloquialisms of comedy than with the elegant stiffness of copied heroic or lyric poetry. Consequently, though the comedians borrowed their metres from the Greeks, they were content to pronounce the words as they were uttered by the common people; and as the busy talkers of the forum were wont to clip and contract their words, so the syllables usually omitted in speaking were not taken into account on the comic stage. When, therefore, we can recognise the law of the verse in a Latin comedy, but find that the syllables, as they stand written in many of the lines, are more numerous than is necessary for the feet of the verse, we may safely conclude that the superfluous syllables were omitted in the pronunciation of the actor; and if by him, *à fortiori*, that they were habitually slurred over by the majority of his audience. This opinion will be confirmed, if we discover, on farther enquiry, that the syllables so dispensed with are not found in the corresponding forms exhibited by the modern idioms which derive their origin from the language of ancient Rome.

---

sanctioned no less by the practice of schools than by the well-known jingle of the Anti-Jacobin; but it is not to be borne that this ignorance should exalt itself to dogmatism. In the third number of the *Classical Museum* (pp. 338, sqq.) there is an article in which we are told that the Sapphic verse, "recited with the true metrical quantity and the natural spoken accent," will read thus: *Jáwm sattees | taêrees ‖ nívis aútque | deêrœ*, &c.; and that the following is a Sapphic of the same kind: *che il gran sepolcro libero di Christo!* And this is delivered, not as a modest suggestion, but as a decree of oracular wisdom.

The following instances, few out of many, may be sufficient to establish this[1]. Let us first take some of the short imperatives, which are, by the nature of the case, especially liable to hurried pronunciation. As our *look!* has degenerated into *lo!*, and the Latin *vide* has become the Italian *ve'*, and the French *voi* or *v'* (in *voi-ci, v'la*); so in Terent. *Adelph.* II. 2, 31, it is clear that we must pronounce this line:

Labáscit: ún' hoc hábyo: vé' si sát placet.

Here, also, we have Italian *abbio.* Similarly, as Cicero tells us[2] that *cave ne eas* was pronounced *cauneas*, we see that the following line (*Phormio*, V. 1, 37) must be pronounced:

Sed pér deós atqu' hómmes, meám's' hanc, cáu rescíscat quísquam.

This line also furnishes the French abbreviation *hommes.* A question might arise whether *deos* might not be a monosyllable = *dyos*, as in Plaut. *Trin.* 520, and *homines* a dissyllable = *hom'nés;* but the commonest rules of emphasis plead for the arrangement which I have proposed. It is impossible that *deos* should be a mere *thesis*, and that an accent should fall on *atque.*

Then, again, as the French say *tai*, it is clear that *tace* is a single long syllable in the following line (*Adelph.* II. 4. 16):

At ut ómne réddat—ómne réddet—taí-mod', ác suire hác—sequor.

Which line also furnishes us with the imperative *suire* for *sequere*, if we may in this case also follow the French analogy. In general there seems to have been a tendency towards softening down the guttural into its ultimate form, the vowel *i.* This has obviously taken place in *faire* and *œil*, derived from *facere* and *oculus;* and not only is the imperative *tace* a monosyllable, but also its indicative *tacet*, as in the following line (*Adelph.* IV. 5, 5):

Tait: cúr non lúd' hunc ál' quantísper mélyus est.

---

1 The reader, who desires a more copious induction, may refer to the well-known essays of Bentley and Hermann; to some compilations, derived from these and other sources, in the *Journal of Education* (Vol. II. pp. 344, sqq.), and in the *Penny Cyclopœdia*, s. v. *Terentian Metres;* and to Ritschl's valuable Prolegomena to Plautus.

2 *De Divin.* II. 40, § 84: "Quum M. Crassus exercitum Brundisii imponeret, quidam in portu, caricas Cauno advectas vendens, *Cauneas* clamitabat. Dicamus, si placet, monitum ab eo Crassum, *caveret ne iret.*"

Where for *al'quantisper* compare Italian *alcuno*, and the French *aucun*, from *aliquis unus*. It can scarcely be doubted that *Adelphi*, III. 2, 20, was pronounced as follows:

'Ad'lescênt' ips' érip'r' cœlos: pósthac praécip'tém darêm;

and that in III. 2, 37, *lacrymas* is a dissyllable after the analogy of *larme*, and of *serment* from *sacramentum*. Similarly, in *Heaut.* V. 5, 16, quoted below, as the ictus falls on *facile*, we may conclude that it was pronounced as a single long syllable. Festus tells us that there was a form *facul*, and *facile* appears as a mere *anacrusis* in the Scipio epitaph (c. 5); above, Ch. VI. § 20. Perhaps the most singular instance of this omission of the guttural is furnished by the French *faible* from *flexibilis;* for in this there is a double collapse.

The imperatives *abi*, *redi*, are monosyllables with the omission of the unnecessary *b* and *d* (*Adelph.* II. 1, 13, and 36), and *jube* throws off its *b* (*Adelph.* V. 6, 1), as it does in the perfect, &c.

The phrase *bono animo es* is shortened for the same reason as the other imperatives. In Plautus (*Rudens*, III. 3, 17) it forms a cretic:

'O salútis meaé spés tac' ác bón-ame és.

We observe the same sort of abbreviation in a number of nouns of common occurrence; such, for instance, as express the nearest degrees of family relationship. The compound *parricida* indicates a contraction of *pater* analogous to the French *père*, and the word was probably so pronounced in such lines as (*Adelph.* I. 1, 51):

Hoc pater ac dominus interest: hoc qui nequit; i. e.
Hoc pére ac dónnus ínterést: hoc quí nequit.

and (*Adelph.* I. 2, 46):

Natura tu illi pater es, consiliis ego; i. e.
Natúra tú gli pére es, cónsiglís ego.

where the ictus falls upon it. In the latter line, as *tu* is emphatic, an elision would be inadmissible; we must therefore pronounce *illi* either as the Italian *gli* or as the French *lui*, and this gives us another modern analogy. In the former line *dominus* is probably a dissyllable following the analogy of *domina*, which becomes *donna* in Italian, and *dame* in French. Similarly,

homines is a monosyllable in the passage quoted above from the *Phormio*; *animus* becomes *ame*; *femina*, *femme*, &c.

That *puer* was often a monosyllable appears from the forms *por*, *pora*, which occur in inscriptions, from the compounds *Lucipor*, *Marcipor*, &c., and from the Spartan ποῖρ for παῖς. In *Heaut.* V. 5, 16, we should read or pronounce as follows:

Gnâte m'yó pol tí do póllam [or *pwéllam*] *lépidam quám tu faíl amés.*

The mood of *ames* shows that the emphatic *illam* would be as out of place here, as it is appropriate in the following line. And *do*, which we should have expected in the first instance (cf. *Andr.* I. 5, 60; II. 2, 15), has been turned into *dabo*, partly from a confusion between the readings *dopuellam* and *daboillam*, and partly by an anticipation of *dabo* in v. 19. With regard to the monosyllabic *ti* for *tibi*, the Romans frequently omitted *b* in the middle of a word: this is most common in the dat. and abl. pl. of the first declension, and is also observable in the French derivatives; such as *où* and *y* from *ubi* and *ibi*. For the change of *puer* into *por*, we may also compare the transformation of *fuere* and *fuerent* into *fore*, *forent*.

Perhaps two of the most striking instances of this clipt pronunciation are afforded by the scansion of the particles *quidem* and *modo*, in both of which the *d* is omitted. With regard to the former even Bentley remarked that it must be frequently a monosyllable in Terence (*ad Andr.* I. 3, 20). The following reasons have been adduced to prove that it was so in general. (1) The analogy of *item*, shortened from *itidem*, will support the pronunciation of *qu'em* for *quidem*. (2) As it is an enclitic, and is regularly attached to certain words, in the same way as περ, γε, &c. in Greek, it seems reasonable to suppose that it would be peculiarly liable to curtailment. Now, if we retain the full form of *quidem* with some of these words, we alter their quantity, and so sacrifice the principal word in order to preserve a mere appendage. Thus, *ego-quidem*, or *eg-quidem*, is marked *ĕgŭĭdem* in books on Latin prosody, and *siquidem*, *quandoquidem*, are marked *sĭquŭĭdem*, *quandŏquŭĭdem*, although the true quantity of the separate words is *sī*, *quandō*; and though in other compounds—*quandōque*, *quandōcunque*—this quantity is invariably retained. It follows, therefore, that *quandoquidem* must have been pronounced *quandōqu'em*; *siquidem*, *sīqu'em*;

and *equidem*, *ēqu'em*; just as *me quidem* must be scanned *mē qu'em* in Pers. I. 10:

Littera: per me quidem sint omnia protinus alba.

In the same way it is manifest that *modo* must often have been a monosyllable: see *e. g.* Ter. *Andr.* II. 1, 2, and II. 4, 6. In the languages derived from the Latin the compound *quomodo* is represented by *como* Sp., *come* It., and *comme* Fr.; in which the *d* is omitted, and in the last, as in the old French *cum* (below, § 9), the syllable is dropt altogether. The knowledge of this abbreviated pronunciation enables us sometimes to correct a faulty reading. But although Ritschl was well aware that *modo* was monosyllabic, and though one of his best MSS. in Plautus, *Trin.* II. 4, 179 = 580, gives the reading *si* for *st*, he has allowed *actumst* to stand when *actum sit* would improve both the metre and the syntax:

L. *Set, Stasime, abi huc ad meam sororem ad Calliclem:*
Dic, hoc negoti quomodo actum sit.
St. *Ibitur.*

The scanning is obviously: *quóm'do actum sit.* It is to be remarked, however, that the *d* of *modo*, *quomodo* is never omitted in writing, and there is, therefore, no justification for the absurd proposal that *immo* or *imo*, which is obviously the adverb of *imus*, should be regarded as a mutilation of *in modo*[1].

§ 6. *The French Language is the best modern representative of the spoken Latin.*

III. We may now pass, by a natural transition, to our third source of information respecting the constitution of the

[1] *Classical Museum*, III. pp. 291—297. The author of this suggestion must have learned in his younger days that an ablative of manner repudiates any preposition; and the violation of this rule in the case of *modus*, above all other Latin words, can only spring from a sort of delusion, fostered by a habit of self-reliance, which has survived the possession and reasonable consciousness of knowledge. The same writer, I am told, has published an expensive edition of Cicero's orations against Verres, in the introduction to which he states that the defendant, a Roman patrician, a *Cornelius* in fact, had no family name. This is an additional proof, if proof were needed, of the laxity of our Latin scholarship.

Latin language—that which exhibits it pathologically, or in its state of disorganisation or decay.

It will not be expected that I should here show at length how the Romance languages were formed from the Latin. It will be sufficient to point out some of the reasons for believing that the French language is a better living representative of the pronunciation of the ancient Italians than the language which is now spoken in the peninsula itself; and, in conclusion, to state briefly what was the process of the disintegration, and in what degree the modern differed from the ancient form.

As the Romans successively conquered the different nations which formed the population of Italy, they gradually included within the limits of a single empire a number of different tribes, who spoke idioms, or dialects, differing but little from the language of the Romans themselves. It is not, therefore, surprising that a gradual amalgamation should have taken place, and that every Italian should have spoken, with only slight variations of accent, one and the same Latin language. The language of Rome itself—the language of government, of literature, and of law—would, of course, be independent of these minor differences. Every educated man and every public functionary would refer to this unvarying standard, and would speak or write, in some cases with pedantic accuracy, the language of the senate-house and the forum[1]. Accordingly, the inhabitants of the provinces, *i. e.* the foreign subjects of the Empire, would hear nothing but pure Roman Latin; and, if they learned the language of their rulers at all, they would at least learn it in the best form. Their position in this respect differed materially from that of colonists, even in ancient times. The colonists of our day, and especially the English emigrants, present a material contrast to the case of the Roman provincials. For, while the colonists who sailed from Corinth or Athens were of all classes—οἱ τυχόντες—our modern colonists are generally those who are either not able to live at home, or, at all events, who practise trades inconsistent with a high amount of educational polish. We find, therefore, that colonial English represents only the vulgar colloquial

---

1 Scaliger partly saw this; he says (*Prima Scaligerana*, p. 99): "Linguæ nostræ Gallicæ potior pars ex publicis instrumentis quæ Latine scribebantur conflata est."

language of the mother-country; whereas the Roman provincials spoke a language derived—imperfectly, it might be, but still derived—from the polished and elegant diction of proconsuls, jurisconsults, negotiatores, and publicani.

The Gauls, in particular, were remarkable for their tendency to assimilate themselves, in their language and usages, to the Romans. In an inconceivably short space of time the province Gallia was completely Romanised[1]. Their own language was out of the pale of civilisation: in fact, they had no mother-tongue to struggle for. A language is only dear to us, when we know its capabilities, and when it is hallowed by a thousand connexions with our civilisation, our literature, and our comforts. So long as it merely lisps the inarticulate utterances of half-educated men, it has no hold upon the hearts of those who speak it, and it is readily neglected or thrown aside in favour of the more cultivated idiom, which, while it finds names for luxuries of civilisation before unknown, also opens a communication with those who appear as the heralds of moral and intellectual regeneration. The Greeks and the Jews had good reasons for loving the language of their ancestors, and could never be induced to forget or relinquish the flowing rhythms of their poets or the noble energy of their prose writers. The case was not so with the provincials of Gaul. Without any anterior predilections, and with a mobility of character which still distinguishes their modern representatives, they speedily adopted the manners and the words of the Romans; and it is probable that in the time of the Empire there was no more difference between the grammatical Latin of Lyons and Rome, than there is now between the grammatical French of St Petersburg and Paris.

---

[1] How completely this was the case even in Cicero's time may be inferred from what he says in his *Orat. pro Fonteio*, 1, § 1: "Referta Gallia negotiatorum est, plena civium Romanorum. Nemo Gallorum sine cive Romano quidquam negotii gerit; nummus in Gallia nullus sine civium Romanorum tabulis commovetur, &c." For the literary culture of Gaul some hundred years later, the reader may consult the commentators on Juvenal, I. 44; VII. 147, 8; XV. 111. Gibbon, who perceived that the language of Virgil and Cicero completely superseded the Celtic idiom in Gaul (Vol. I. p. 64, Milman), extends the same remark to other provinces to which it is not equally applicable.

§ 7. *The modern Italian not equally so: and why.*

From what I have just said, it should appear that the Latin spoken in Gaul was upon the whole better and purer than the Latin spoken in the municipal districts of Italy during the time of the Empire. Let us, however, suppose that they were only equally good. Then, if it can be shown that the disturbing causes were greater and more efficacious in Italy than in Gaul, we shall still have a greater surplus of good Latinity in the latter.

Before the Italian language revived as a vehicle of literary communication, the peninsula had been subjected to a series of invasions, which had modified and corrupted in no slight degree the speech of the country people. This was effected not only by the influence of the conquerors, but also by the infusion of a considerable amount of foreign population. In Lombardy and other parts, where the invaders formed a permanent settlement, the change was most sensibly and durably felt; whereas Tuscany, which had been screened by its position from any permanent or extensive occupation by the northern tribes, was not exposed to this corruption of its familiar language, and its greater wealth, its commerce, and its independence, preserved among its inhabitants a residuum of the old Latin literature and civilisation.

When, therefore, vernacular composition revived in Italy, it was emphatically Tuscan. It is true that the new literary language spread itself over the whole of Italy, and that there were varieties of accent in the different districts[1]. Still, however, a purity of Tuscan phraseology is essential to literary correctness: and whatever a man's native accent may be, he must accommodate it to this court-language. It follows, therefore, that the pronunciation of modern Italian must be syllabic. In other words, it must be more akin to the studied accuracy with which the Romans of the Augustan age pronounced their Græ-

[1] On these differences of Italian articulation Matthæus Ægyptius writes as follows (*ad S. C. de Bacch.* p. 145): "Quosdam audias ore adstricto, et inter dentes, dimidiata verba tanquam invitos, et cum quadam parsimonia efferre, ut Ligures: quosdam ore patulo et laxo, claraque et sonora voce, animi sensus effundere, ut Neapolitani faciunt: medios inter hos Senenses, *queis Musa dedit ore rotundo loqui.* Adderem Florentinos nisi ex imo gutture pronuntiantes originem adhuc ostenderent Phœniciam."

cised poetry, than to the natural articulation of the ancient Italians. It has been truly said, that the Italian language cannot be pronounced both well and quickly. This is only another expression of the fact, that a literary language, which is not natural, can only be articulated syllabically. The qualification of *lingua Toscana in bocca Romana* is another illustration of the same fact; for here we have a recognition of the truth, that the modern Italian is a written language to be pronounced according to its syllables, and that of the accents, in which it can be pronounced, the best and sweetest is that of a well-educated inhabitant of the pontifical metropolis.

§ 8. *Dialects of the French Language.*

Very different was the case of the Gauls. After living for several hundred years under the dominion and influence of the Romans, and having lost their Celtic language and in a great measure their Celtic character, they were invaded and partially conquered by a confederation of German warriors, who called themselves *Franks*, a name indicating their bold and martial character[1]. The domination of these rude conquerors did not

[1] It has usually been supposed that the word *Frank* denotes "freeman," so that "French" and "Latin" would, when referred to their etymology, appear as synonymous terms. This is not, however, the original meaning of the word *Frank:* though, in a secondary sense, the word has borne this signification. In the Teutonic languages, to which it belongs, the word *fra-n-k*, or *frak*, is equivalent to *ferox*, and signifies "bold," "warlike," "intrepid" (see Thierry, *Lettres sur l'Histoire de France*, Lettr. VI. p. 436, Bruxelles ed.). The name, therefore, according to its original signification, refers to the martial qualities, just as the name of the *Rasena* (which may also be compared with the Hebrew רִנָּה) expresses the rapid movements of warlike hordes (cf. *Joel* II. 4). Some nations have derived their name from their physical characteristics. Thus, as we have seen (p. 29), the *Pelopes* and *Pelasgians* of Greece got this appellation from the sun-burnt complexion of the colonists from Lydia. And there can be little doubt that the ivory shoulder of the mythical Pelops was suggested by the white necks of those Asiatics, who wore high dresses (Thucyd. I. 6), and consequently did not expose the whole of their person to the sun. That men and women differed in complexion in Greece, and that a sedentary in-door's occupation might produce a difference of colour, is clear from the remark in Aristophanes (*Ecclesiaz.* 385) that the parliament of women looked like an assembly of cobblers:

destroy the Roman texture of the language which was spoken by the inhabitants of Gaul. At first both the conquerors and the conquered retained their own idioms; and the *lingua Francisca*, or *Francica*, of the German invaders flourished by the side of the *lingua Gallica*, or *Gallicana*, of the conquered provincials. In time, however, as there was much more literary culture among the latter, and as the priests and scholars of the age were all furnished by the district in which the Franks had settled, the standard of diction would be sought in the language of the more educated class, and the Roman language, more or less corrupted, would gradually become the medium of communication between the conquerors and the conquered.

As might have been expected, this gradual adoption of the Roman language by the Teutonic invaders gave rise to a number of dialects. Of these the most refined and polished was that which was spoken by the inhabitants of the south-eastern district of France. Many causes conspired to give this idiom an earlier development. The south-eastern provincials were more completely Romanised in the first instance[1]; they were less subjected to foreign invasion than the other inhabitants of France; the Burgundians and Visigoths, who settled among them, were more adapted to social life than their German brethren, and more readily assimilated their language and customs to those of their subjects; and when at length Provence became a part of the Frankish dominions, the conquerors were no longer unruly German barbarians, but the civilised and Romanised subjects of a

---

οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' ὑπερφυῶς ὡς λευκοπληθὴς ἦν ἰδεῖν ὁμιλία. I remember that on one occasion, when a highland regiment landed in kilts from the West Indies, where they had worn trousers, it was remarked that their faces and legs did not match. Ethnical names, in addition to their primitive meaning, are often used as expressive of certain qualities, whether the use is complimentary or not. *Assassin*, *Gascon*, *Vandal*, and *Goth*, are attributive words in our own language; the word *Slave* has been derived from the low estate of the *Sclavonians;* and even in ancient times, Κάρ, Κρής, Παφλάγων, Μυσός, Συβαρίτης, Σκύθης, &c., were terms significant of qualities. The German confederacy of the *Franks* seems to have corresponded to that of the *Iscævones;* those of the Saxons and Thuringians to the *Ingævones* and *Herminones* respectively. (See above, p. 68).

[1] It is right, perhaps, to say, that Marseilles in particular was rather Græcised than Romanised: see Cic. *pro Flacco*, 26, § 36.

regular monarchy. The happy climate of Provence, and the wealth and commerce of the people, contributed to foster and encourage those arts which can only flourish in a genial soil; and we are not to wonder if the provincials outstript the northern Gauls in intellectual tastes as well as in physical comforts.

The connexion between Provence and Catalonia tended to increase the civilisation of the latter. But, in reference to the present object, to discover a Romance language which shall most accurately represent the spoken language of the Romans, we may safely dismiss the Spaniards; whose language, already corrupted by the invasions of the Suevians and Visigoths, has been still farther disorganised by the pervading and durable influence of the highly civilised Arabians.

The people of Provence were keenly sensible of the difference between their own language and that of their Franco-Gallic rulers. The names, by which they distinguished their own country and that of the French, referred to the differences of the idioms spoken in them. It is singular that this difference should have been expressed in terms of the affirmative particle, which they had respectively adopted. Drawing a line through Dauphiné, Lyonnais, Auvergne, Limousin, Perigord, and Saintonge, the country to the south of this was called *Langue d'oc*, the district to the north of the line was termed *Langue d'oyl*. Now, although the differences between the *Langue d'oc* and the *Langue d'oyl* consisted mainly in the greater or less development of the Latin element in each, it is to be remembered that these affirmative particles are both due to their Teutonic affinities[1]. And here is the inconsistency; the words *oc* and *oyl* are equally Frankish or German, and yet the people of the *Langue d'oc* distinguished their language from that of the *Langue d'oyl* by calling it *Roman, lemozi, provensalesc;* and they termed themselves *Provinciales*, i. e. *Romanæ Provinciæ inquilini*, as distinguished from the *Francigenæ* of the north.

---

[1] According to Grimm (*D. Gramm.* III. p. 768), *oyl* is *ja il*, and *oc* is *ja ich;* the only difference between them being, that the affirmative is combined with the first person in the one case, and with the third person in the other. To me it appears that *oyl* is simply the affirmative *wel* or *wohl* (for this power of the initial *o* see above, p. 49), and that *oc* is the German *auch* = *etiam* (*Phil. Mus.* II. p. 345).

§ 9. *But all these Dialects were closely related to the Latin.*

But whatever were the distinctions between the languages of the northern and southern inhabitants of the province of Gaul, it is clear that the language of the whole country was to the middle of the ninth century A. D. a very near approximation to the Latin. We have the original of an oath which was sworn at Strasburg in 842 A. D., by Lodewig, king of Germany. This interesting document, which is expressly stated to have been in the *Romana lingua*, is in the following words[1]: "*Pro Deu amor et pro Christian poblo et nostro commun salvament, disi di en avant, in quant Deus savir et podir me dunat, si salvarat io cist meon fradre Karle, et in adjuda et in cadhuna cosa, si cum om per dreit son fradre salvar dist, in o quid il mi altresi fazet: et ab Ludher nul plaid numquam prindrai, qui, meon vol, cist meon fradre Karle in damno sit.*" It appears from the context of the history, that the oath was couched in this language in order that it might be understood by the French subjects of Karl le Chauve. It was, therefore, the common language of the country; and as it is free from Germanisms, and exhibits only those corruptions of the Latin for which it is easy

[1] Nithardi *Hist. ap. Scr. Rer. Francic.* VII. p. 26, quoted by Thierry, *Lettres sur l'Histoire de France* (lettr. XI.). Substituting the Latin words which come nearest in etymology to the words of this fragment, we have: *Pro Dei amore et pro Christiano populo et nostro communi salvamento, de isto die in ab-ante, in quantum Deus sapere et posse mihi donabit, sic salvare habeo ego ecc' istum meum fratrem Carolum, et in adjutu et in quaque una causa, sic quomodo homo per directum suum fratrem salvare debitus est, in eo quod ille mihi alterum sic faciet; et ab Lothario nullum placitum numquam prendere habeo, quod, mea voluntate, ecc' isti meo fratri Carolo in damno sit.* It is not necessary to enter upon any lengthened discussion of the corrupt Latinity of these words. That *salvar-ai*, &c., are *salvare-habeo*, &c., is well known. It appears from the oldest forms of the words that the French *cel, cest* (*cist*), Italian *quello, questo*, are the compounds *ecc' ille* and *ecc' iste* respectively. For, as in Provençal we have *aisso*, in old French *aezo*, into which *ço* enters, so we have *icel* and *icest*, anterior to *cel* and *cest*. Similarly *ici* is *ecc' ibi*. Of *altresì*, which is common in Italian, Varchi says: "*Altresì* è Provenzale, non Ispagniuolo, e gli antichi nostri scrivevano *altresíe*, e non *altresì*." Comp. *altrettale, altrettanto*. The French *aussi* represents *altresì* with the usual change of *l* into *u*.

to account, it furnishes us with a distinct confirmation of the opinion, that we ought to seek in the language of France for the best modern representative of the language of ancient Italy.

Among the political or official terms, which the Franks adopted from the Latinised inhabitants of Gaul, and which show the extent of the influence to which I am referring, not the least interesting are the titles *maire* and *bailli*, which designated the primary and secondary offices in a municipality or district. The former name is a corruption of the Latin adjective *major*, and it was originally used as an epithet to the term *præpositus*, which has left its traces in the French *prévôt* and our *provost*. Hence, it happens that *mayor* in England and *provost* in Scotland are synonymous designations for the chief of a municipal body. On the other hand, the word *bailli*, It. *balio* or *bailo*, is derived from the Latin *bajulus*, sometimes corrupted into *baillivus*, and denoted the secondary officer or deputy. According to its etymology *bajulus* for *bar-iolus* (cf. *pejor* for *per-ior*) denoted a *bearer* of *burdens*, and so the word is connected with *φερ-*, *φορ-*, *bhri*, *fer*, *bar-dus*, *bar-o*, *βασ-τάζω*, &c. (Döderl. *Syn. u. Et.* I. 151). In his official duties, therefore, the *bajulus* or *baillivus* was a *chargé d'affaires*, one who bore the weight of office on behalf of others. And not to speak of the profound and solemn meaning of the phrase in *Isaiah* IX. 5 : וַתְּהִי הַמִּשְׂרָה עַל־שִׁכְמוֹ, "and the government shall be upon his shoulder," we may remember that the Arabic وزير *Vezîr*, which signifies "vicarius principis," is derived from the verb وزر, *vazara*, which means "sustinuit onus grave." The relation between the Scottish *baillies* and their *provost* is precisely that which subsisted between the *baillivi* and their *major*, or *præpositus*, or *præpositus major*, namely, the latter was the chief, and the former his vicars or deputies. Thus we find the *major* or *præpositus* in a cathedral, by the side of the *bajuli* or *baillivi conventuales* or *confratriæ;* we have *major domus* in the royal palace, by the side of the *bajuli de palatio;* and in general, wherever there was a term of authority, the *bailli* represented the *vice-comes*, *vice-gerent*, *deputy*, or *regent*. The military use of the term *major* belongs to the same application of the Latin word. While the *lieutenant*-general, or *lieutenant*-colonel is the deputy of the full

general or colonel, the *major*-general or *major* is so called in reference to the rank immediately below him; thus the *major*-general is the *præpositus* or *maire* of the colonels in his division, and the *major* is the *præpositus* of the captains in the regiment, just as the serjeant-*major* is the chief of the serjeants, and the drum-*major* of the drummers. In its lowest application the term *baillie* or "bailiff" still signifies a deputy, and the mere "tipstaff" or "catchpole" is called by this name because he is the sheriff's officer, or the deputy *pro re nata* of that *præpositus* of the county or district.

The difference between the modern Italian, considered as the offspring of the new Tuscan literature, and the old French, regarded as a scion of the Roman language which was spoken in the province of Gaul, consists in the fact to which I have already adverted—namely, that the former would reproduce the mincing and pedantic pronunciation of the literary Romans, while the latter would retain the genuine colloquial utterance of the free colonists of the empire. It is worthy of observation that the French language itself enables us to illustrate this difference. If we examine the French language as it is, we shall often find double forms of derivatives from the Latin. Now in every one of these cases it is remarkable that the older word—that which belongs to the oldest and most genuine vocabulary—differs most from the written form or syllabic pronunciation of the Latin original. Thus *chanoine, chétif, chez, chose, hôtel, naif, Noel, pitié, pousser*, from *canonicus, captivus, casa, causa, hospes, nativus, natalis, pietas, expulsare*, are older forms than *canonique, captif, case, cause, hôpital, native, natal, piété, expulser*. (See A. W. Schlegel, *Observations sur la Langue et la Littérature Prov.* p. 44.) The fact is, that the latter were derived from the written, the former from the spoken language.

§ 10. *Leading Distinctions between the Roman and Romance Idioms.*

The manner in which the transition from the Latin language to the French may be supposed to have taken place is well known, and very easily described. In this place we must be contented with a few brief remarks; for it would be an idle attempt to discuss as a secondary matter the details of a subject which admits of such ample illustration, and which has already

been treated at great length, though with various degrees of success, by Raynouard, Schlegel, Diez, Ampère, Fuchs, and Lewis.

The tendency of the spoken Latin language to clip and mutilate itself began at an early period to militate against the regularity of the grammatical forms. With regard to the verbs, it has been shown above that the organic inflexions had been in a great measure superseded by secondary or compound tenses before the commencement of the classical age; and that the person-endings are obliterated, or deformed by inconsistencies, in the oldest specimens of the written language. In regard to the verbs, then, the change from the Roman to the Romance is merely a further development of that which was already in operation. The Roman case-system was in itself more complete than the conjugation of the verb; and therefore we may expect to find greater changes in the French noun as compared with the Latin. In general it may be remarked, that when the tendency to abbreviation has commenced its action on the flexional forms of a language, certain devices are at once adopted for the purpose of preventing any syntactical obscurity. Indeed, the logical or syntactical development of a language is generally benefited by the change; and where the etymological organisation becomes imperfect, the literary capabilities of the particular idiom are extended and confirmed.

There is good reason for believing, that in the spoken language of the ancient Italians the difference between the subjective and objective cases of the noun was at an early period neglected or overlooked (see Lepsius, *ad Inscript.* p. 120). At any rate, it is clear that this was the first step towards the breaking up of the Roman case-system. The accusative case was substituted for the nominative, and all the subordinate relations were expressed by prefixing prepositions to this new crude form of the noun. We observe a tendency of the same kind in vulgar English; and perhaps this passage from the subject to the object may be explained on general principles, without any reference to the want of grammatical education on the part of those in whom it is most observable. Connected with this employment of prepositions, to give definiteness to the crude forms of nouns, is the use of the old Roman demonstratives *ille* and *ipse* to mark a definite object, as contrasted with *unus* and

aliquis-unus, which denote indifference. This is, of course, identical with the use of the definitive article in the Greek and other languages; and the Romance languages owe much of their acknowledged perspicuity to this adaptation. It is true that the artifice is not applied with the logical subtilty by which the employment of the Greek article is distinguished; but any deficiency in this respect is amply compensated by the strictly logical order of the sentences in which the words are arranged.

It is not necessary in this place to say much on the subject of the Romance verb. Where the tenses have preserved the forms of the Latin verb, we observe a systematic abbreviation. Labials are absorbed, according to the practice so remarkable in Latin; final syllables are dropt, and the accent is thrown forward. We sometimes find that what appears to be an arbitrary corruption is really only an attempt to represent in writing some genuine articulation of the old Latin; thus we have seen above (p. 244) that a palatal may take the place of a labial in French, when the latter is followed by *i*, as in *sapiam = sapjam*, Fr. *sache* (cf. *ravir* and *arracher* from *rapio* and *arripio*). We see the process of this change in the Provençal. Thus, we have in the celebrated prison-song of Richard Cœur-de-Lion:

> "Or *sapchon* ben miei hom e miei baron
> Englès, Norman, Peytavin, e Gascon,
> Qu' ieu non ai jà si paubre companhon,
> Que per aver lo laissès en prison."

Where *sap-ch-on = sap-i-ant = sachent:*

> "Know all my lieges and my barons true
> From England, Normandy, Guienne, Poitou,—
> I would not leave the poorest of my train
> In dreary dungeon for the love of gain."

The *z* which represents the Latin *-tis* in the second person plural of all present tenses of French verbs, except in the cases of *êtes* and *faites* for *estis* and *facitis*, is not equivalent to *ts*, as some have supposed, but stands for the dental sibilant, which followed the *t* in the older Romance languages; thus we have *avetz = habetis* before we find *avez*, and even *etz* for *estis* before *êtes*. That *z* is merely an *s*, so written after *-t*, is clear from its similar appearance as a plural affix to nouns and participles, as in *gentz = gentes = gens, toutz = tous, escriptz = écris*, &c. Generally, the number of compound or auxiliary tenses is very much

increased in the Romance as compared with the Latin verb. In addition to the verbs *sum* and *fui*, we find that *habeo* and *sto* are regularly pressed into the service. Verbs in their first formation construct their perfect and future tenses with the aid of *habeo;* for the past participle with *habeo* makes up the former (as *j'ai aimé = ego habeo amatum*), and the regular future consists of a combination of the same verb with the infinitive (as *j'aimer-ai=ego habeo amare*). This analysis of the Romance future was probably known to Sainte Palaye, who cites the main proof of it, namely, the fact that the infinitive was sometimes separated from its auxiliary by the interposition of another word (see Bopp, *Annals of Oriental Literature*, p. 45). But the formal enunciation of this view was first made by Raynouard (see *Grammaire Romane*, p. 221; Lewis *On the Romance Languages*, p. 194); and there cannot be the least doubt of its truth. This is shown not only in the *tmesis*, to which I have referred, but also by the varying forms of the future in the different Romance languages, which correspond to the varieties in the form of the present of *habere*. Thus, on the one hand, we find: "et quant cobrat l'auran, *tornar* l'*an* e so poder per fe e sencs engan" = "et quand recouvré l'auront, *tourner* l'*ont* en son pouvoir par foi et sans tromperie."

"E pos mon cor non aus dir a rescos,
Pregar vos *ai*, s'en aus, en ma chansos."

= "et puisque mon désir je n'ose dire à cachette, *prier* vous *ai*, si en ose, en ma chanson." On the other hand, we see that the present of the verb, corresponding to *habeo* in each of the Romance languages, is duly represented by the corresponding affix of the future. Thus we have:

ITAL.	SPAN.	PROV.	FRENCH.
ho	*he*	*ai*	*ai*
amer-ò,	*amar-é,*	*amar-ai,*	*aimer-ai;*

and similarly of the other persons. In Italian the future also exhibits the longer forms in *aggio* or *abbo*, as in *dir-aggio*, "I shall say," *far-abbo*, "I shall make" (cf. *far-ebbe*, &c.). It is obvious that the same explanation must apply to the secondary tenses. For if the future *aur-ai, aur-as, aur-a, aur-em, aur-etz, aur-an*, is compounded of the infinitive *aver* and the present *ai, as, a, avem, avetz, an*, it is clear that the conditional *aur-ia, aur-ias,*

aur-ia, aur-iam, aur-iatz, aur-ian must be made up of the same infinitive and the subjunctive present *a-ia, a-ias, a-ia, a-iam, a-iatz, a-ian.* And thus *amar-ia* will not represent *amarem*, as some writers have supposed, but will exhibit the same agency of the auxiliary verb as the future *amar-ai.*

The indeclinable words in the Romance languages are particularly interesting, as examples of the manner in which frequent use contributed to the abbreviation of phraseology in these idioms. In some shorter words the alterations are very slight, as in *a* for *ab*[1], *donc* for *tunc, avant* for *ab-ante, av-ec* from *ab-esc* for *ab-usque* (cf. the Provençal *duesc* for *de-usque*, Raynouard, *Gramm. Rom.* p. 318), *ailleurs* for *aliorsum, dorénavant* for *dehora in ab-ante, mais* for *magis, jamais* for *jam magis, ensemble* for *insimul, de-main* for *de mane, moins* for *minus, quand* for *quando, car* for *quare, derrière* for *de retro, assez* for *ad satis, si* for *sic*, whence *ain-si* for *in-sic, souvent* for *subinde, dont* for *de unde, maintenant* for *manu tenens, or* for *hora, désormais* for *de ista hora magis, trop* for the Low Latin *troppus*, "a large number" (as "si en *troppo* de jumentis." Lex Al. ap. Raynouard, *Gr. Rom.* p. 317), *prêt*, Ital. *presto* for *præsto*, &c. Other particles are much more corrupted: *per* becomes *pour; post* is changed into *puis; prope* into *près*, whence *au-près, a-près*, &c.; *secundum* passes through *segont* into *selon; même*, from *medesimo*, brings us back to the corrupt form *met-ipsissimus; sine* is shortened into *sans* or lengthened into *senza;* while *aut* appears as *ou, ubi* and *ibi* are turned into *où* and *y; paucies*, which was *pauc* in the Romance languages, becomes *peu* in French, &c. I should be inclined to place *tôt*, Rom. *tost*, Ital. *tosto*, in the former class, but Mr. Lewis says (*Rom. Lang.* p. 248) that "no probable explanation of its origin has hitherto been given." I am not aware what interpretations have been proposed, but it seems to me obvious that *tosto* is merely the adverb of the corresponding adjective, derived from the Latin *tostus*, and signifying "swift," "sudden," "all in a heat," "hot with haste," so that it is synonymous with *ardens.*

---

[1] In the Provençal language, as in modern French and Italian, *a* or *ab* bore the sense of *apud* = *ab-ad*, and signified location in all its forms: *av-ant* = *ab-ante, devant* = *de-ab-ante, av-ec* = *ab-usque*, &c.

§ 11. *Importance and value of the Latin Language.*

In the preceding pages I have indeavoured to write the history of the Latin language, and to characterise its peculiarities, from the earliest period of its existence down to the present time, when it is represented by a number of daughters, all resembling their mother more or less, and all possessing in some degree her beauties and defects. Of these, it can hardly be doubted that the French has the best claim to the primogeniture and inheritance. The Latin and French languages stand related to one another, not only in the connexion of affinity, but still more so in the important position which they have occupied as political and literary organs of communication. They have both striven to become the common language of civilised and educated men; and they have had singular recommendations for the office which they partially assumed. For power of condensation, for lucid perspicuity, and for the practical exposition of common matters, there are few idioms which can compete with the Latin or the French. In many particulars they fall far behind the Greek and the German; in many more they are surpassed by the English; and it seems now to be determined that neither Cæsar nor Napoleon was destined to reverse the decree of Providence, that man, though the one reasoning and speaking creature, should, in different parts of the world, express his thoughts in different languages. If there is one idiom which seems both worthy and likely to include within it the articulate utterances of all the world, it is our own,—for we, too, "are sprung of earth's first blood," and the sun never sets upon our Saxondom. But the dignity of our English speech, and its wide diffusion by means of our commercial enterprise and missionary zeal, do not suggest any argument or motive, which should induce us to neglect or discourage the study of the old Roman literature. Though the Latin tongue will never again become the spoken language of Europe, there is no reason why it should not resume its place as the organ of literary communication,—why, with its powers of conciseness and abbreviation, and with its appropriation of all the conventional terms of science and art, it should not still flow from the pens of those who have truths and facts to communicate, and who are not careful to invest or disguise them in the embellishments of some modern and fashion-

able style. This at least is certain, that the Latin language has struck its roots so deeply and so permanently in our own language, that we cannot extirpate it, if we would; for we must know Latin, if we would thoroughly understand our own mother-tongue; even those who are least learned, and most disposed to undervalue classical attainments, are very liable to further what others would call the corruption of our language, by the introduction of new terms erroneously formed after a Latin model[1]; and whatever changes may take place in the professional education of Englishmen—though the Universities may cease to bestow the highest degrees in their faculties upon those who have passed through the Latin exercises of their schools—though the meeting of Convocation may never again be inaugurated with a Latin sermon at St. Paul's—though a study of Justinian and Gaius may be pronounced of no use to the lawyer—though even Roman history may lose its general interest—though physicians may decline to prescribe and apothecaries to dispense according to the phraseology of a Latin *materia medica*—though the House of Commons may no longer bestow the sanction of parliamentary applause on well applied quotations from the classical authors—still, a competent acquaintance with the language and literature of ancient Rome will be indispensable to every one, who lays claim to a complete cultivation of his reason and taste, and who wishes either to understand and enjoy the writings of our best authors, or to enrich the English language with new examples of its capacity for terse arguments, happy expressions, and harmonious periods.

---

[1] It would be easy to cite a long list of words in *-ation*, which are not formed from Latin roots, and are certainly not due to the Latin scholarship of those who first used them. The verb "to base" for "to cause to rest on a basis or foundation" is a modern corruption so common that I cannot hope to have avoided it in my own writings, though I am quite aware that according to all analogy "to base" or "abase" must mean "to depress" or lay low, not "to build up."

INDICES.

I.

ETHNICAL NAMES, AND NAMES OF PLACES OR COUNTRIES.

Abella, 115, 127
Ænus, 7
Æqui, 5
Agathyrsi, 41
Αἰθίοψ, 30
Alba, 5
Ambrones, 62
Angli, 71
Anio, 7
Apulus, 5
Argos, 13
Ἄριοι, 41
Asia, 41
Atella, 127
Auruncus, Αὔσων, 4
Cære, 166
Cascus, 5
Châwilah, 57
Courland, 60
Cumberland, 63
Daci, Danes, 43
Dorian, 42
Eden, 56
Etruscus, 69
Falerii, 243
Frank, 448
Getæ, Goths, 43
Herminones, 42, 68
Hirpini, 60
Humber, 63
Iguvium, 79
Ingævones, 68, 71
Ἴων, *Javan*, 39, 41
Irân, 40
Languedoc, 450
Larissa, 13
Latinus, 6, 61
Lavinium, 6
Leleges, 63
Ligyes, 63
Lithuanian, 61
Μαιδοί, 39
Massagetæ, 42
Mysi, 39
Northumberland, 63
Opicus, Oscus, 4
Pahlavi, 41
Πάρθος, 39
Πελασγός, 29, 448
Πέλοψ, 29, 448
Piceni, 8
Pomeranians, 70
Prussians, 70
Quirites, 60
Rasena, 69, 448
Rætians, 67
Roma, 60
Romanus, 414
Sabinus, 7
Sacæ, 41
Sauromatæ, 41
Saxon, 41
Sclavonian, 61
Scolotæ, 44, 58
Servians, 66
Sintians, 39
Σκύθαι, 40
Thames, 46
Thracians, 39, 42
Thuringians, 42
Thyrea, Thyræon, 13
Thyssagetæ, 41
Tiryns, 13
Toltecs, 14
Τυρρηνός, 12
Tuscus, 16
Umbri, 62
Veneti, 66
Vindelici, 67
Volscus, 5
Wineds, 66

II.

SCYTHIAN WORDS.

aba, 54
Apia, 49
ara, 54
araxa, 54
Araxes, 48
Arimaspi, 52
Artemis, 51, 54
Artimpasa, 51
Borysthenes, 47
brix-aba, 54
Dan-ubius, 46
Dnieper, 47
Dniester, 46
dun, 46
enarees, 54
Eri-danus, 48
Exam-pæus, 54
Ger-rus, 46
Grau-casis, 53
halinda, 54
Hypa-caris, 46
Hypan-is, 46
Is-ter, 45
Mæotis, 51
masadas, 51
Octa-masadas, 49
Oito-surus, 49

Oior-pata, 53
Panticapes, 47
Papæus, 48
pata, 53
phru, 54
phry-xa, 54
Porata, 46
Rha, 48
Rho-danus, 48
Sparga-pises, Spargapithes, 51
Tabiti, 48
Tami-masadas, 51
Tana-is, 47
Temarunda, 51
Tyres, 46
xa, 54

III.

UMBRIAN WORDS.

The Alphabetical List in pp. 99—101, and the following.

abrof, abrons, 91, 280
aferum, 85
ahaltru, 102
anzeriates, 88
ape, 85
arsie, 85
arsmo, 97
arepes, 96
arveitu, 82
arves, 96
arvia, 92
buf, 91
dersecus, 97
dupursus, 99
enetu, 88
enumek, 94
erar, erer, 96
erek, eront, 85, 315
erus, 85
eso, 85
este, 88
etre, 99
feitu, 92
ferine, 92
festira, 82
fos, 96
fri, 96
frite, 96
frosetom, 85
furenr, 82
futu, fututo, 85
habe, &c. 85
heris, 92
heritu, 92, 98
hont, hondra, huntra, hondomu, 85, 315
kapire, 82
karetu, 85
Krapuvius, 91
kupifiatu, 85
kurnase, 95
kutef, 93
mers, 96
nep, 83
nerf, 97
nume, 84
okris, 84, 92
orer, 98
ose, 98
paker, 96
parfa, 95
peica, peiqu, 95
pepe, 102
pernaies, 88
persei, 97
peskler, 85
persklum, 88
pesetom, 85
peturpursus, 99
pihatu, 82
pir, 98
poe, 84
poplus or puplus, 84
portatu, 96
pre, 89
prumum, 99
prusesetu, 81
pufe, 85
pune, pus, pusnaies, 85, 88
punus, 102
purtinsus, 85
pusei, puze, 85, 97
pustru, 85
seritu, 88
sevakni, 94
sevum, 8, 93
skrehto, skreihtor, 86
stahito, 82
steplatu, 95
subator, 97
subokau, suboko, 96
sue-pis, 96
tases, 94
tertie, 99
tera, 82
tesenakes, 90
tesva, 95
titis, 102
tota, 84, 93
tover, 85
treplanes, 90
tuplak, tupler, tuves, 99
vas, vasetom, 85
vatuva, 91
vehiies, 90
veres, 89
virseto, 85
vitlup, 83
ulo, 96
uru, 96
ustentu, 92

IV.

OSCAN WORDS.

The Alphabetical List in pp. 105—116, and the following.

æteis, 123
aisken, 126
akenas, 132
aktud, 124
akum, 127
allo, 126
amirikatud, 126
amma, 131
amnud, 120
ampert, 123
angit, anget, 119
anter, 119
araget, aragetud, 119
Ausil, 112
Bansæ, 125
Bantins, 125
Degetasius, 119
deivaid, deivast, 119
dikust, 124
dolum, 120
egmo, egmazum, 120
eituam, eituas, 121
eizazunk, 127
embratur, 88
estud, 121, 126
esuf, 126
esak, 121
etanto, 123
Evklus, 131
famelo, 126
fefakust, 122
feihos, 129
fiisna, 129
flusare, 90
fortis, 123
fuid, fust, 127
Futris, 131
Herekleis, 435
herest, 123
hipid, 121
him, 127
iok, ionk, 120
kadeis, 121
karneis, 119
kastro, 122
kebnust, 126
kensam, kensaum, 125
kensazet, 125
kenstom, 126
kenstur, 125
kerus, 131
keus, 125
kom, 124
komenei, 120
komono, 120
kontrud, 123
kvaísstur, 83
ligis, ligud, 127
likitud, 122
loufir, 122
maimas, 119
mais, 119
mallum, malud, 121
manimaserum, 127
meddisud (pru-), 126
medikatud, 126
mesene, 90
minstreis, 123
molta, 119
moltaum, 123
neip, nep, 127
nesimois, 127
op, 124
pa, 126
pam, 125
Patana, 132
Perna, 132
pertemust, 120
perum, 120
petiropert, 124
piei, 120
pis, 111, 121
pistia, 132
pod, 121
poizad, 126
pokapit, 121
pomtis, 124
pon, 125
post-esak, 121, 317
præfukus, 127
præsentid, 126
preivatud, 124
prof-tuset, 129
pru, 121
pruhipid, 121
prumedikatud, 123
pruter, 125
puf, 126
regator, 132
Q[uæstor], 119
sakaraklum, 435
senateis, 120
set, 127
siom, 120
sipus, 124
skriftas, 127
slagis, 129
suæ, 120
tadait, 122
tanginud, 119
teforom, 48, 132
toutiko, 126
tribarakat, 129
tuset, 125, 129, 184
valæmom, 122
verehasius, 132
vinkter, 126
umbrateis, 120
urust, 124
zikolom, 124

V.

ETRUSCAN WORDS.

The Alphabetical List in pp. 151—164, 182, 183, and the following.

achr, 175
Afuna, 188
ama, 179, 187
Ancaria, 149
Apulu, Aplu, 148
Aril, 163
Aritimis, 37, 50, 54
Aruns, 103
Ausil, 113
Cæcina and Cæcilia, 188
Caphatial, 178
caratse, caresri, carutezan, 184
ceca, 170
cechaze, 170
cehen, cen, 175
Ceres, 149
cerurum, 186
chfinchfe, 102
clen, 171
cver, 176
eca, 175
ein, 186
Elchsntre, 142
epana, 168
Epure, 170
erai, 168, 175
ersce, 175
etera, 171
ethe, 168
eu, 179
Feronia, 147
flenim, 179
fuius, 169
hareutuse, 184
heczri, 186
helefu, 168
hintha, hinthiu, 186
ipa, 186
ir, 168
Janus, 143
Juno, 145
Jupetrul, 170
Kalairu, 169
kemulmleskul, 187
kethuma, 167
Kupra, 107, 145
lar, 150
lat, 178
lauchme, 102
lautn, lautnescle, 179
lisiai, 167
Mantus, 148
maram, 167
Mars, 146
mathu, 167
Matuta, 147
Menerfa, 146
Merqurius, 150
mi, 167
murzva, 186
nac, 175
nastav, 168
nesla, 175
nethu, 168
Nethuns, 148
Nfatia, 178
ni, 167
Nortia, 149
phleres, 173, 376
phruntac, 161
Phupluns, 192
Porsena, 16
Rasne, 188
ril, 305
sains, 186
Saturnus, 146
Secstinal, 142
Sethlans, 145
sie, 168
Soranus, 148
Sothina, 148
stem, 178
sver, 176
Summanus, 144
suthi, 175
Tanaquil, 71
tanna, 177
tephral, 48
telur, 186
tenilaeth, 178
Thalna, 145
Thana, 178
thaura, 176
Thekinthul, 179
thmtflaneth, 179
thipurenai, 153, 168
thues, 185
thura, 176
Tina, 143
tulati, 187
Turce, 170
trce, 174
Turms, 150
Velthina, 188
Velthu, 168
Vedius, 145
vorsus, 150
Vertumnus, 146, 386
Usil, 113
Utuze, 142

VI.

GREEK WORDS.

ἄγαλμα, 152
ἄγριος, 268
ἄδην, 256
αἰθή, αἰθός, 50
αἰρέω, 92
αἶσα, 50, 152
αἰών, 409
ἄλις, 256
ἀμείνων, 160
ἄμπειρα, 199
ἀνά, 331
ἄναξ, 150, 253
ἀπήνη, 157
Ἀπία, 4, 49
ἄργος, 13

Ἄρης, 54, 147
ἀριστερός, 147
ἄρσην, 54
Ἄρτεμις, 54, 129
ἀσύφηλος, 164
Ἄτροπος, 150
αὐτός, 315
Ἀφροδίτη, 288
Βερενίκη, 47
βλίττω, 241
Βόσπορος, 47
βοῦς, 155
βοῶπις, 37
βύργος, 47
γελέοντες, 159
γέφυρα, 418
γηρύων, 149
γλυκύῤῥιζα, 251
δαήρ, 255
δάκρυον, 255
δαλίς, 107
δαλός, 255
δαπάνη, 168
δαψιλής, 255
δεικηλίκτης, 158
δειλός, 255
δεινός, 107
δημόσιος, 275, 281
διά, 333
διπλάσιος, 417
διχομηνία, 158
δρῶ, 76
δῶρον, 256
ἔαρ, 386
ἐγρήγορθαι, 383
ἔζεσθαι, 253
εἰ, 253
εἴκων, 158
εἰμὶ and γίγνομαι, 349
ἐλεύθερος, 6
ἑλλός, 253
ἐμέ, 315
ἐν, εἰς, 331
ἐναργής, 304
ἐνέγκειν, 149
ἕπομαι, 263
ἐπιτήδειος, 291
ἔρις, 267
ἔρχομαι, 76, 387
ἔστε, 321
εὐχερής, 304
ἕως, 288
ἑωυτοῦ, 268
Ζεύς, 143, 303
ἥλιος, σελήνη, 146
ἡμέρα, ἱμέρα, 268
ἥμερος, 268
ἤπειρος, 269
θάλασσα, 252
θαῤῥεῖν, 255
θεῖος, 185
θέμις, indecl. 291
θέναρ, 304
θήρ, 243
θῆς, 185
θῆτες, 125
θύρα, 255
θώρηξ, 256
θῶυμα, 268
ἴδιος, 288
Ἱμέρα, 268
καιρός, 392
καλός, 255
κεῖνος, 314
κέραννυμι, 392
κλύω, 62
κόσμος, 251
κούρητες, 24, 107
κραναός, 109
κρίνω, 392
κρύσταλλος, 53
λάμος, &c. 151
λέως, 288
λίτρα, 6
λοίδορος, 160
λοξίας, 25
μάντις, 149, 245
μάρτυς, 304
μαστός, 61
μάτην, 160
μέθυ, 167
μέλαθρον, 154
μέλας, 29
μελετάω, 420
μεός, 309
μεσημβρία, 241
μετόπη, 35
μή, 338
μηνύω, 147
μύριοι, 264
ναθμός, 168
νέω, 148
ξένος, 206
Οαρίων, 244
ὄασις, 49
ὀδούς, 257
Ὀδυσσεύς, 142
οἶστρος, 49, 250
ὀπώρα, 4
οὐ, 98, 338
οὐρανός, 425
οὗτος, 312
ὀφείλω, 380
παραστάς, παστάς, 34
παραστῆναι, συμπαραστῆναι, 298
παρέχω, 379
παρθένος, 242
πασάσθαι, 102
πατήρ, 48
πείθω, 384
πέλαγος, πελάγιος, 305
πελαργός, 30
πέλιος, πελιδνός, 29
πέρνημι, 392
πιπράσκω, πρίαμαι, 388
πίπτω, 384
πίνω, 102
πλήρης, 256
ποίημα, 406
ποινή, 424
ποῖρ, 441
πόλις, 93
πρύλεες, 264
ῥεῖθρον, 162
ῥοῖβδος, 250
σαίνω, 258
σελήνη, 146, 157
σίφων, 164
Σοωδίνα, 147
στυφελός, 243
σχέτλιος, 252
τάλις, 145
τανύω, τείνω, 178
τέμενος, 405
τερμίς, 323
τῆμος, 150
τίς, 143
τῖφος, 48
τρέχω, 76, 387
τύραννος, 13
τύρσις, 13
υἱός, 170
ὕπνος, 253
Φλιάσιος, 417
φολκός, 242
φύω, 169, 347
χαμαί, 168
χαοί, 5

χάρμη, 253
χεῖλος, 168
χέω, 373, 418
χήν, 155
χθαμαλός, 76, 167
χίλιοι, 379
χιών, 379
χλωρός, 158
χῶρος, χορός, χώρα, 268
ὠκεανός, 425
ὠνέομαι, 388
ὠφελῶ, 383

VII.

LATIN WORDS.

a, ab, abs, 330
ac, atque, 429
accerso, 352
accipiter, 155, 300
accuso, &c. 265
acer, 404
acerra, 219
acervus, 195, 404
actus, 124, 270
acua, 250
ad, 331
adeps, 92
adhæsum, 153
adoro, 216, 375
adulo, 258
advena, 403
æditimus, 263
æger, 263
aeneus, ahenus, 82
æreus, æneus, 256
æstimo, 262
æternus, 146
ager, 296
ala, 423
alimentum, alimonia, 406
aliquis, 322
alius, 313
almus, alo, 388
alumnus, 97, 406
amanuensis, 332
ambitus, 212
ambo, 327
amicus, 256
amo, amor, 54, 389, 410
amœnus, 160
ampirvo, 198, 9
amsegetes, 213
ancilla, 149
anfractus, 213
anguis, 157
annus, 163, 425
ante, 332
antid, 306
antiquus, 268
antrum, 412
anus, 163
apud, 332
arboresco, arboretum, 396
arbustum, 301
arcera, 204
arcesso, 352
asper, 429
aspernor, 392
assiduus, 204
atrox, 404
auctumnus, 386
augur, 263
aula, 435
auriga, 426
auris, 256, 426
autumo, 263
aurum, 113
avena, 157
aveo, 75
bajulus, 452
bellum, 240
berber, 196
berbex, 54
bibo, 102, 383
bis, 240
bitumen, 241
blandus, 424
bonus, 240
bos, 303
bruma, 434
caduceus, 256
cædo, 392
cæruleus, 259
Caius, 286
calvitur, calumnia, 204
canis, 302
cano, 387
cantilena, 214
canus, candidus, 53, 106
capesso, 352
capio, 390
caput, 54
caput, capud, 299
carcer, 435
cardo, 269
carmen, 299, 406
carnifex, 419
castrum, 412
castus, 53, 122
catamitus, 256
caterva, 195, 404
catervatim, 289
cauneas, 441
celer, 25, 302
celsus, collis, &c. 171
ceremonia, 406
cerno, 392
cerus manus, 198
ceu, 179
ceva, 155
choraulœdos, 198
cieo, cio, 381
cimeterium, 265
cippus, 243
circa, circum, circiter, 335
citus, 381
civis, 125, 303, 404
clam, calim, 291
cliens, 64
clipeus, 271
cœlebs, 257
coemo, 390
cœna, 106
cohors, 82
colonia, 249
cominus, eminus, 291
comissari, 81
compæscuus, 212
concapes, 211
confuto, 376
congruo, 247
considero, 376
contaminare, 435
contemplor, 376

contio, 257, 435
contra, 335
coquus, 250
cor, 299
coram, 291
corvus, 155
cosol, 257
creo, cresco, 396
crus, 161
cubo, 374
cuicuimodi, 436
cujus, &c. 321
culmen, 171
cum, 335
cumera, 115
cunæ, 435
cuneus, 195
cunque, 325
cupio, 390
cur, 249
curia, curiatius, 24
custos, 122, 298
de, 333
debeo, 76, 380
debilis, 76
decumanus, 269
deliro, 271
demo, 333
demum, 322
denique, 322
denuntio, 235
deploro, 376
dequim, 231
desidero, 376
dextra, 96
di, 286
dice, 196
diffensus, 207
difficultas, 267
Digentia, 255
digitus, 405
diligo, 387
dissicentes, 97
divido, 158
do, 372
dolus, 430
Domitius, 257
domo, 374
donec, 322
donum, 256
duco, 229
Duillius, 240
dumtaxat, 231
dunque, 198
e, ex, 331
eapse, &c. 316
Ecastor, &c. 436
eho, ego, eja, &c. 310
elementum, 140
emo, 388
enim, 126
enos, 195
eo, 382
equidem, 443
equus, 404
ercticisco, 210
erga, 289, 335
eruditus, 141
escit, 201, 346, 396
esum, 345
et, 331, 429
exiguus, 434
exilis, 434
exim, 287
existimo, 262
explodo, 265
exploro, 374
facesso, 352
facie, 196
facul, 229, 442
fagus, 242
famelicus, 302
familias, 279
Fatua, 156
fatuus, 92
favor, 410
febris, 403
fendo, 397
fera, 241
ferio, 397
fero, 310, 397
filius, 169, 347
finalis, 422
findo, 158, 256
fio, 347
flamma, 402
flecto, 386
fœcundus, 348
fœdus, 423
fœmina, 348
fœtus, 348
folium, 239
forceps, forfex, forpex, 297
forem, 349
fovea, foveo, 156
frangere, 239
fraus, 430
frausus, 217
frustra, 160
fui, 348
fundus, 270, 418
fungor, 390
Gaius, 246
gena, 245
generosus, 300
genus, 245
gigno, 388
glisco, 171
globus, 244
Gnæus, 246
gnarures, 279
granum, 245
gruma, 61, 270
grus, 157
habena, 157
habeo, 378
hæreo, 247, 378
heluo, 168
heres, 378
Herminius, 25, 141
heri, 76
herus, 25
hibernus, 244
hic, 310, sqq.
hiems, 300
hinc, 288
hir, 92
hodie, 435
homicida, 431
homo, 25
honestus, 301
honor, 410
Horatius, 25
hortus, 212
hospes, 206
hostis, 206
humus, 76, 167, 247
idem, 316
ideo, idoneus, 291
idus, 158
igitur, 204, 289, 342
Ilithyia, 265
ille, 310, sqq.
im, 234
imitor, 158
imo, 444
imperator, 111
imus, 435
in, 331

inclitus, 271
inde, 287
induco, 222
indulgeo, 76, 423
infensus, infestus, 398
infit, 399
iniquus, 262
inquam, 112, 249, 342, 352
inquilinus, 249
inquiro, 262
instar, 291
intelligo, 387
inter, 332
interatim, 208
interea, 317
interpres, interpretor, 419
invitus, 93
ipse, 316
ipsippe, 316
iracundus, 364
is, 315
iste, 310, sqq.
item, 443
iterum, 255
judaidiare, 267
jugerum, 124, 269
jurgium, 213
juvenis, 302
juxta, 335
lacesso, 352
lacryma, 255
lanius, 158
lapicidinæ, 435
lapiderum, 281
lappa, 243
largus, 151
larva, 151
lentus, 393
levir, 255
liber, lœber, 122, 296
librarius, 231
ligare, 255
limes, 269
lingua, 255, 423
lino, 393
lira, 159
lis, 224, 259
longinquus, 256
lórica, 256
ludus, 141, 160
luervem, 195, 404
lupus, 251
luridus, 158
luscus, 25
luuci, 235
lympha, 255
macte, 286, 436
mala, 149, 435
mando, 149
manifestus, 304
manus, 147
Marcipor, &c. 443
mare, 75, 304
Mars, Mavors, &c. 146, 150, 244
massa, 267
materia, -es, 302
meā, &c. 317
meditor, 420
mel, 299
melior, 244
mens and animus, 146
mentum, 149
merces, 298
mergus, 97
meridie, 256
mile, miles, 264
Minerva, 146, 404
minister, 123
minus for non, 338
mis, 308
modo, 443
mollis, 435
moneo, 378
monstrare, 147
multimodis, 436
muscipula, 431
musso, 81
namque, 322
nanxitor, 209
narro, 61
naufragus, 431
navalis, 423
ne, nec, and non -quidem, 339
nec, 98, 210, 338
necesse, 306
negligo, 98, 387
nego, 98, 422
negotium, 98
negritu[do], 98, 260
negumo, 199
nempe, 322
nequinont, 251
Nero, 54
nihilum, 436
nix, 297
non, 338
nonus, 327
nostri, nostrum, 309
nudiustertius, 327, 436
num, 339
nuncupo, 210
nuntius, 257
ob, 334
obedio, 265, 334
obesus, 334
obliquus, 159
obliviscor, 396
obrussa, 81
obstetrix, 297
obstinere, 92, 199, 334
obsto, 298
occentare, 214
occultus, 250
octavus, 327
odi, 399
officina, 276
officium, 298
oleaster, 158
olfacit, 255
olim, 314
ollus, 314
omentum, 435
omnimodis, 436
onus, 410
onustus, 410
oportet, 76
oppidum, oppido, 93, 334
ops, 4
optimus, 329, 334
os, 299
oscines, 95
osem, 198
otium, 435
pagunt, 205
palam, 291
paries, 264
parochus, 379
pars, 291
partim, 275
patefacio, 352, 437
paullus, 435
pectuscum, 21
pedester, 416
pejero, 332
pejor, 328, 452
pelagus, 305
per, 332

perennis, 163
pergo, 264
pestis, 404
peto, 384
pigeo, 122
pipulo, 113, 214
pilumnus, 199
plaustrum, 413
pleores, 173, 195
plorare, 173, 200, 374
plumbum, 245
poema, 266
polenta, 271
pollex, 297
pomœrium, 335
pondus, 418
pone, post, 335
pono, 395
pontifex, 419
populus, 192
porcet, 435
porrigo, 85, 178
portus, 207
posco, 76
posthac, &c. 121, 317
postliminum, 335
pote, potis, 306
præ, præter, pro, propter, 332
prædium, 122, 298
præsens, 298
prætor, prætura, 360
prætor, &c. 411
pravus, 54
precor, 76
prehendo, 82, 399
pretium, 420
primus, 327
proceres, 25
procul, 291
prœlium, 264
proficiscor, 261
proletarius, 204
promulgare, 244
propinquus, 256
propitius, 257
propter, 291
propterea, 316
prosper, 429
prudens, 435
puella, 415, 435
puer, 443
puniceus, 243
purgo, 426
quæro, 352
qualus, 435
quando, 323
quandoquidem, 443
quantus, 301
quapropter, 317
quare, 249
qua propter, 121
queo, 382
ques, 232, 320
qui and quis, 232, 320
quia, 320
quidam, 322
quidem, 322
quippe, 323
quispiam, 322
quisquam, 320
quisque, 322
quisquis, 322
quivis, 324
quomodo, 444
quoque, 325
quoquus, 250
quorsus, 150
radere genas, 218
rastrum, 412
ratio, 305
re = ἀνά, 337
re = rei, 310
reapse, 316
redantruo, 199
refert, 310
regio, 76
rego, 387
religio, 407
remus, 402
reor, 305
repetundarum, 363
repudio, 226
res, 246, 303
rettuli, 257
reus, 206, 305
ricinium, 218
rixa, 267
robustus, 300
rorarius, 265
rostrum, 412
rota, 255
ruber, 6
rudimenta, 141
rudo, 384
ruma, 61
rupitia, 215
rursus, 150
rus, 247
sacellum, 435
sacramentum, 231
sæculum, 146
sagitta, 75
sanates, 204
sarpta, 211
scando, 397
scilicet, 273, 362
scribere, 240
scriptor, scriptura, 360, 411
se, 308
secundus, secutus, 364
securis, 75, 107
sed, sine, 208
sedulo, 231, 430
semel, simplex, &c. 327
Semones, 196
sempiternus, 146
senex, 253, 297
sequester, 416
sero, 393
sesquipes, sesquipedalis, 425
sestertius, 212
severus, 8
sibilo, 164
sibus, 124
sicilicus, 124, 270
silva, 27
simul, 291
sino, 393
siremps, 236
sis = si vis, 436
socer, 296
sodes, 436
solari, 435
sollemnis, 114
sollers, 114
solus, 314
sonticus, 206
speres, 279
sperno, 392
sponte, 314
Spurius, 26
squama, 250
statim, 336
sterno, 256
stipendium, 435
stipulus, 95
sto, 373

strenuus, 114
suad, 120
sublimis, 435
subtilis, 435
sueres, 281
sum and fio, 349
summus, 435
suovetaurilia, 428
supellex, 297
ta = da, 196
tabeo, 48
taciturnus, 417
tædet, tardus, 122
tandem, 435
taxo, 231
tectifractis, 436
tellus, 93
temno, 269, 392
tempero, 392, 420
tempestas, 205, 300
templum, 89, 144, 269, 392, 405
tempus, 392
tendo, 178
teneo, 379
tenus, 291
tepidus, 48
terra, 93
Tiberis, 171
tis, 308
Titus, 26
toga, 164, 423
topper, 243
torquular, 249
torres, 168
tot, 93
totus, 93
trans, 335
trebla, 90
tripudium, 198, 226
trucido, 404
tuber, 244
tugurium, 212
ullus, 322, 338
ultro, 314
unus, 264, 327
urvo, 124
usque, 321
uterque, 327
utpote, 324
vacca, 4
vanus, 435
Varro, 54
vasargenteis, 437
vates, 244, 302
vaticinari, 244
vehemens, 32
Vejovis, 145
velum, 435
veneo, venumdo, 352
venilia, 29
ventus, 152
venum, 360
Venus, 244, 300
venustas, 301
ver, 386
veratrum, 412
verecundus, 364
verto, vertumnus, 386
veru, 242
vestri, vestrum, 309
veto, 374
vicus, vicinus, 212
videlicet, 352, 437
viduus, 158
viginti, 240
villa, 212
vindex, 111
vindico, 352
vir, 53
vis, vires, 318
virgo, virago, 54
vitricus, 242
vitta, 49
vivus, 97, 250
vox, 403
zona, 295, 403

VIII.

LATIN TERMINATIONS.

a, 403
ago, 300
alis, 414
anus, 414
ao (verb), 373, 422
ar, 300
aris, 414
arium, 413
ax, 403
b, 298
ber, bra, brum, 413
bilis, bundus, 76, 426
bulum, 413
c, 298, 403
cer, cris, crum, 413
culus, 413, 414
cus, 403
d, 298
dus, 404
ea, 403
edo, 300
ensis, 415
eo (verb), 377, 423
er, 296, 300
ero (verb), 420
es, 302, 403
ester, 416
etum, 414
eus, 403
ia, 403
ico (verb), 421
icus, 403
ido, 300
idus, 404
idius, 416
iensis, 415
ies, 403
igo, 300
ile, 414
ilis, 414
ilius, 416
in, 300
inus, 414
io (verb), 382, 422
io, 406
ior, 410
is, 301, 403
isso (verb), 394
ito (verb), 419
it-s, 24, 264, 420
ius, 403
l, 300
lentus, 393
lus, leus, 405, 414

men, mentum, 299, 405
mnus, mna, mnum, 406
mon, 405
monia, 406
mus, ma, 402
n, 406
ndus, 301
no (verb), 385, 391
nt, 417
nus, na, num, 405
on, 407
or, 300
osus, 409
r, 300, 405
rt, 298
rum, 405, 412
s, 405
sco (verb), 395
strum, 412
t, 298, 405
ta, 405
tat-, tut-, 301, 410
ter, tor, 296, 300, 411, 416
timus, tinus, 417
tio, 407
tis, 298, 404, 415
tivus, 404
terium, torium, 411
tn, 417
tric, 297, 411
tro (verb), 420
trum, 411
tudo, 300, 411
turio (verb), 421
turus, tura, 411
tus, ta, tum, 405
tus, tûs, 403
v, 303
ulo (verb), 421
um, 412
urio (verb), 421
us, -i, 296
us, -uris, 300
vus, 404
x, 297, 403

IX.

FRENCH WORDS.

a, 457
abeille, 252
age, 258
aigre, 252
ailleurs, 457
aimé, 257
aimerai, 454
aimois, 241
ainsi, 457
ame, 442
Anjou, 257
Août, 252
apôtre, 258
arracher, 455
Arras, 257
assez, 257, 457
aucun, 259, 326, 442
aumône, 259
aune, 259
aussi, 451
autel, 259
autre, 259
Autun, 252
Avalon, 240
avant, 332
avec, 457
aveugle, 252
avoir, 240, 244
avois, 240
avril, 244
bailli, 452
Besançon, 240
biais, 259
bougre, 259
Bourges, 257
Briançon, 252
cage, 241
Cahors, 257
canonique, 453
car, 457
case, 453
cause, 453
Cavaillon, 240
cel, cet, 451
cendre, 257
chacun, 451
Châlons, 257
chambre, 241
changer, 241
chanoine, 453
chaste, 251
chataigne, 251
chaud, 251
cheoir, 251
cher, 251
chétif, 453
cheval, 251
chevestre, 244
cheveu, 244
chevre, 244
chez, 251, 453
chien, 251
choux, 251
chose, 453
cochère (porte), 90
combler, 241
comme, 444
corbeille, 252
courtois, 257
dais, 252
dame, 442
demain, 457
derrière, 457
desormais, 457
devant, 332
diacre, 259
Dijon, 241
dit, 252
donc, 457
dont, 457
dorénavant, 457
droit, 287
ensemble, 457
ensevelir, 244
écrire, 241
epître, 258
esclave, 61
étage, 258
évêque, 244
Eure, 257
Evreux, 240
expulser, 453
faible, 442

faire, 441
faisons, 251
femme, 443
feu (*focus*), 252
feu (*felix*), 259
foi, 257
fois, 252
foyer, 252
gendre, 258
genièvre, 244
grè, 257
Grenoble, 257
gué, 257
guerre, 249
Havre, 255
hommes, 441
hôpital, 453
hors, 241
hôtel, 452
Huguenot, 257
ici, 451
jamais, 457
jeu, 252
Langres, 259
larme, 252, 442
lieu, 252
lièvre, 244
liquorice, 251
lire, 252
Loire, 252
loisir, 251
Londres, 255
Lyons, 252
Maçon, 257
maigre, 252
maintenant, 457
maire, 452
mais, 252, 457
mariage, 258
marquis, 257
Mayence, 257
Mayenne, 257
Melun, 257
même, 457
minuit, 119, 257
moins, 457
nager, 241
naif, 453
natal, 453
natif, 453
Nevers, 259
neveu, 244
noel, 453
noir, 252
nombre, 241
nu, 257
nuire, 252
oc, 450
œil, 441
œuvre, 244
or, 457
Orne, 258
où and ou, 443, 457
ouvrir, 244
oyl, 450
page, 257
paien, 252
pauvre, 244
pays, 257
père, 257, 442
persifler, 164
peu, 252, 457
piété, 453
pirouetter, 200
pitié, 453
plaisir, 251
poids, 126
Poitiers, 252
poitrine, 251
poix, 252
pour, 457
pousser, 453
près 457
prêt, 457
prévôt, 452
puis, 457
quand, 457
queue, 257
rage, 241
ravir, 455
recevoir, 244
reine, 252
Rennes, 257
rien, 245
roche, 244
Rodez, 257
rossignol, 258
Rouanne, 257
rougir, 241
sache, 244
sans, 457
sage, 244
savoir, 244
Seine, 251
selon, 457
serment, 252, 442
si, 457
siffler, 164
souvent, 457
suis, 258
suivre, 441
sujet, 241
tai, tait, 441
tendre, 257
titre, 258
tôt, 457
trop, 457
Troyes, 251
vendredi, 257
vie, 257
voici, voila, 441
voir, 257
y, 443, 457
Yonne, 251

X.

MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS.

A.

Abella, 115, 127
Accent in Latin, 434
Æneas, 7
Æschylus, *Choeph.* 350; explained, 334
— *ib.* 779; explained, 387
— *Eum.* 975; explained, 309
— *Prom.* 830; explained, 52
— *Suppl.* 313; explained, 312
Æsculapius, 141
Ἀέτωμα or tympanum, 33
Africanus, epitaph on his son translated, 223
Agnone (tablet of), 130
Agylla, 166
Alba, 5
Alphabet, 80, 238
Amaduzzi (J. C.), 165
Ambrones, 63
Anchises, 7
Apollo, 37
Architecture, Pelasgian and Doric, 32
Arethusa, 37, 54, 170
Argos, arx, 13
Arimaspian, 52
Ariosto, 53, 304
Aristophanes as an authority for the Scythian language, 45
Artemas, 435
Artemis, 37, 50, 54, 170
Article in Latin rather *is* than *hic*, 315
Articles in Romance languages, 455
Artimpasa, 50
Arthur and his round table, 38
Aspirates, 247
Atella, 127, 135
Atellanæ, 132 sqq.
Aufrecht, (Dr.), 87
Avon, 46
Aztecs, 14, 57

B.

Bacchanalibus (Sen. Consult. de), 232
"Bailiff," 453
"Baillie" (in Scotland), 452
Bantine table, 116, 234
"Base" (to), a corruption, 457
"Bet," 298
Betham (Sir W.), 87
Bevan (Mr. Beckford), 179
Bewcastle and Bridekirk (runes at), 189
"Beyond," 315
"Bias," 259
Bishops, their titles, 415
Bonarota, 15, 87, 139
Bopp (F.), strictures on, 370, 394, 366
βοῶπις, as an epithet of Juno, 37
Borysthenes and Dnieper identified, 47
Bridges, original idea of, 418
Burgon's Inscription, 141, 167
Burnouf (J. L.), 344

C.

Cæles (Cæres) Vivenna, 22, 26, 259
Cære, 166
Camers, 9
Canticum in Roman plays, 133
Carthage (old treaty between Rome and), 193
Cases, their confusion in Latin, 274; in Romance, 454
Carvilius, 246
Cato, 196
Celer, 24, 155
Celts in Italy, 62
Charon, 149
Chawilah, where? 57
Cicero, *Orat.* II. 9; explained, 323
Cicero *ad Att.* I. 17; explained, 408
— *Tus. Disp.* I. 12, *Phil.* I. 6; explained, 408, 9
Claudius (the emperor), 262
Cocles, 24
Columna Rostrata, 229
Comedy (Roman), 133
Complexion affected by the sun, 30; by sedentary habits, 448
Conditional propositions, 357
Copulative conjunctions, 429
Corinth and Lycia, 33
Crown or *scudo* as a coin, 155
Cumber-land, 63
Curiatius, 24
Cyclopian architecture, 32

D.

"Dais" in a Gothic Hall, 252
Dacians and Danes, 43
Danaë, 37
Dante, 102
Danubius, 46
Darius and his horse, 53
Daulis and Doris, 43
Davus and Geta, 43, 66
Dentists, 219
Demas, 435
Dempster (J.), 139
Dirksen (Dr.), 203
Dnieper or Danaparis and Borysthenes, 47
Dniester, 46
Dodona, the doves at, 30
Don, 48
"Donna," 442
Dorians and Thracians, 42
Doric architecture, 34
Doris and Daulis, 43
Duilius (C.), his victory, 229
Duumviri perduellionis, 201

E.

Eden (four rivers of), 56
English, 71

Epaphras, 435
Equus Tuticus, 115
Ethnical names, 448
Etrusci or Hetrusci, 69
Etruscan alphabet, 140
Etruscan inscriptions, 165 sqq.
Etruscan language, 19, 68, 140 sqq.
—— their town and country dialects differed, 20
Eugubine Tables, 78
Euripides, *Iph. T.* 113; explained, 35
Europa, 37, 54
Exodium, 133

F.

F, its compound structure, 242, 354
Falerii, Falisci, and Halesus, 243
Fœnus unciarium, 216
Fortuna, 149
Franks and Iscævones, 449
French and Latin, their close affinity, 451; similar destiny, 458
Future in Romance languages, 456

G.

Garnett (Mr.), 4, 290
Garumna, 63
Gauls, parallel between them and the Etruscans, 19
Geryon, 149
Geta and Davus, 43, 66
Getæ, Goths, 39, 41; contrasted with Dacians, 43
Gihon = Oxus, 56
"Give," 373
Gladiatorial schools, 141
Grimm (J.), his law, 239
Graff (Dr.), 248
Gray (Mrs. Hamilton), 30, 72
Grotefend (Prof.), 87
γρῦπες, 53
Guest (Mr. E.), 239

H.

Hallam (Mr. H.), 437
Harlequin, 137
Hebrew etymology, 49, 56, 73, 75, 147, 153, 155, 167, 171, 185, 305, 311, 325, 337, 349, 379, 385, 387, 392, 410, 412, 448
Hercules, 141
Herminius, 25
Herminones and Hermunduri, 42, 68
Herodotus, i. 58; emended, 11
Hirpinus, 60, 109
Homer emended, 383
Horace explained, 315, 362, 363
Horatius, 24
Huguenot, 257
Humber, 63
Hyacinthia, 37

I, J.

Janiculum, 37
Janus, 36
Javan, 39, 41
Iceland, 68
Icelandic, 141, 152, 154, 156, 159
Jehôvâh, 349
Iguvium, 79
Incendiaries, their punishment, 215
Ing, 71
Ingævones, 68; and Saxons, 449
Interest, rate of, 216
"Interest," 310
Io, 37
Irân, 40
Isaiah ix. 5; illustrated, 451
Iscævones, 68, 449
Ister, 46
Italian (modern), 447
Jutes and Goths, 43

K.

Kenrick (Mr. J.), 54, 142
Kirchhoff (Dr.), 87
Klenze (Prof.), 105
κύκλωψ, 38, 52

L.

Languedoc and Languedoyl, 450
Larissa, 13
Lartius, 24
Lassen (Prof.), 87
Latin, its value, 459
Latinus, Lavinus, Latvinus, 6, 61
Laws of Rome (Regal), 200; XII. Tables, 203; Silian and Papirian, 230
Leleges, 63
Leonidas of Tarentum, conjecturally restored, 228
Lepsius (Dr. R.), 12, 87
"Lieutenant-General" and "Major-General," 452
Ligurians, 62
Liquids, how articulated, 141
Lithuanians = Samo-Getæ, 43, 59, 65
Livy, his testimony to the Rætian origin of the Etruscans, 17; on the Atellanæ, 132; explained, 364
Livius Andronicus, 135
Lobeck, 143
Lubedon for Laomedon, 244
Luceres, 21 sqq.
Lucretius and the Luceres, 24 sqq.
Lucretius explained, 168, 171
Lycophron, 150
Lydians, 31, 189

M.

M omitted, 196
Maccaroni, 138
Magister populi = Dictator, and magister equitum = tribunus celerum, 23
"Major" in the army, origin of the name, 453
Mandela, its modern name, 244
"Mayor," 452

Metre, Saturnian, 225; true theory of ancient, 226; Sapphic and Alcaic, 439
Meyer (Dr. C.), 168
Michalo Lituanus, 60
Milton, 304
Mithra and Artemis, 50
Mithras, 38, 50
Mimus or Planipes, 134
Mædi in Thrace, 39
Mæotis, 51
Mœsia, Mysia, and Mœsogoths, 42, 43
Mommsen (Theodor), 105
Monophthalmia deities, 52
Mulvius (Pons), 168
Mycenæ, gate of the lions at, 32 sqq.

N.

Newman (Mr. F. W.), 64 98, 195
Niebuhr, 3, 5, 15, 18
Numeral signs, 272

O.

Oakes (Mr. J. H. P.), 178
oc and *oyl*, their etymology, 450
Οἰτόσυρος and οἰτόσκυρος, -α, 50
Oldest French, specimen of, 451
"Oriel" window, 427
Ormuzd, 51, 52
Oscus, 4
Ovid, *Fast.* v. 21; corrected, 326
"Ox," its etymology, 4, *note*

P.

Paris and Borysthenes, 47
"Park" and "Paddock," 256
Participle, 291
Pathology of language, 432
Πελασγός, 30
Pelasgian worship, 36
Pelops and his ivory shoulder, 448
Persius explained, 286
Perugian Inscriptions, 180
Piceni, 8, *note*
Pishon = Wolga, 56
Plautus emended, 444
Pomorani, 70
Populonia, 168
Porsena (his monument), 190
"Prevent," two meanings of, 298
Priests, as imposers of pecuniary fines, 419
Priscian, 366
Provence, 450
Provost, 452
Prussian (origin of the name), 70, *note*
Pruth river, 46
Punch or Polichenello, 138

Q.

Q, its compound structure, 248
Quinna, 71
Quintilian, 242, 339
Quirites, 107

R.

Ræti, 18
Râmâyana quoted, 41
Rasena, 17, 18, 68, 448
Raynouard (M.), 456
Richard Cœur-de-lion, 455
Richborough, 257
Rick-burners, their punishment by the old Roman laws, 215, fr. 10
Rivers and mountains, 46, 171
Road-making and civilisation, 269
Rochester (name of), 244
Roma Quadrata, 90
Romance languages, 452
Ros, 70
Rückert (Dr. E.), 7
Runes (Icelandic), 177
Russian, long words in, 434

S.

Sabines, 7, 8
Sacæ, 41
Salian song, 197
Sallust explained, 363, 364, 379
Sarmatæ, Sauromatæ, Syrmatæ, 41
Saturnian verse, 225, 443
Satyrical drama and the *Atellana*, 137
Saxons, 41
Shakspere, 304
Schmitz (C. von), 187
Schrieck (Adriaen), 87
Schwartze (Dr.), 262
Scipios, epitaphs of, 222
Sclavonians, 58, 60, 66
Scolotæ, 44, 58
Scandinavian symbols of speed, 69
Scythians, 40 sqq.; their language, 44 sqq.; their rivers, 45 sqq.; their deities, 48 sqq.
Secchi (G. P.), 150
Semitic and Sclavonian, 73
Semitic architecture, 35
Servians, 66
Sibilants in Semitic and Sclavonian, 74
—— in old Italian, 80
Sigynnæ, 41
Smith's *Dictionaries*, strictures on, 135, 163
Sophocles, *Trach.* 11, explained, 304; *Ajax*, 579, *Œd. C.* 1219, 361
Spain, corruption of Latin in, 448
Sparga and Svarga, 52
Spolia opima, 202
Sporadic and central races, 56, 57
Strabo emended, 153
Sulla, a writer of Atellanæ, 137
Sûrya and σύριον ἅρμα, 49
Symeon Magister, 70

T.

Tacitus explained, 315, 363
Talassus, 145
Tanaquil, 71
Tarquin, 71
Ταυροπόλος, as an epithet of Artemis, 37
Temarunda, 52
Tenses, 344

Terence, *Adelph.* I. 2, 50; explained, 327; *Heaut.* v. 5, 16; emended, 443
Terentian metres, 441 sqq.
Teres, 42
Thames, 46, 51
Θαμιμασάδας, 51
Thucydides explained, 361, 379
Thuringians and Hermunduri, 42, 449
Thyrsagetæ, 41
Tiburtine inscription, 220
Tina and Janus, 71
Titus, titis, titienses, 26
Tor, 70
Triglyphs, 35
Trojans in Italy, 6
"Tues"-day, 186
Tyres and Dnies-ter, 46

U, V.

Ulysses, 142
Umbria, 8, 62
Umbro river, 9
Valla (L.), 311
Varges (Dr.), 198
Varro, 54, 104
Veneti, 67
Vertumnus, 386
Vesta, 48
Vezir, meaning of the title, 452
Vindelici, 67
Vindobonum, 67
Virgil explained, 152, 283, 305, 364, 368, 375, 381, 416, 425, 426
Vites and Vithes-læth, 43
Volsinii, 168

W.

"Wager," 298
Watling Street, 269
"Wedding," 298
"Wether," 4, *note*
Wends, 66

X, Y, Z.

Yaçna quoted, 37, 52, 53
Y and X, 142
"Zany," 138

FINIS.

U. C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES
C045904163

420 759
D676

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY